JESUS THE ISRAELITE WAS NEITHER A 'JEW' NOR A 'CHRISTIAN': ON CORRECTING MISLEADING NOMENCLATURE

John H. Elliott

University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA, USA
elliottj@usfca.edu

JSHJ

Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus

Vol. 5.2 pp. 119-154
DOI: 10.1177/1476869007079741
© 2007 SAGE Publications
Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore
http://JSHJ.sagepub.com

ABSTRACT

Distinguishing between insider and outsider groups and their differing nomenclatures is essential for accurate interpretation and translation. Jesus and his earliest followers, evidence demonstrates, were called 'Israelites', 'Galileans' or 'Nazoreans' by their fellow Israelites. 'Israel', 'Israelites' were the preferred terms of self-designation among members of the house of Israel when addressing other members—not '᾽Ιουδαῖος', 'Jew' or 'Judaism'. Modern interpreters and translators of the Bible, it is argued, should respect and follow this insider preference. ᾽Ιουδαῖος, an outsider coinage, is best rendered 'Judaean', not 'Jew', to reflect the explicit or implied connection with Judaea. It was employed by Israelites when addressing outsiders as an accommodation to outsider usage. The concepts 'Jew', 'Jewish' and 'Christian' *as understood today* are shaped more by fourth century rather than first-century CE realities and hence should be avoided as anachronistic designations for first-century persons or groups. Use of 'Christian' is best restricted to its three NT appearances. The use of appropriate nomenclature is crucial for minimizing historical and social inaccuracies and misunderstandings.

Key words: Christian, ingroup-outgroup nomenclature, Israelite, Jesus' identity, Jew, Judaean, Judaism, Paul's identity, social identity, terms of self-designation

Introduction

Jesus was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian'.[1] This is true at diverse levels and stages of discourse. For one thing, Jesus was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian' in the sense that these terms are used today in ordinary discourse. As Jacob

1. The first version of this study was presented on 22 May 1997 at an international meeting of the Context Group in Prague, Czech Republic, with the title, 'Jesus was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian': Dangers of Inappropriate Nomenclature'. A modified version with approximately the same title was presented on 9 August 2004 at the annual meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Neusner and a growing number of scholars have been emphasizing for some time now, the concept 'Jew' as understood today derives not from the first century but from the fourth and following centuries CE. It denotes persons shaped by and oriented to not only Torah and Tanakh but Mishnah, Midrashim and Talmudim.[2] In similar fashion the name 'Christian' as used and understood today designates persons marked more by doctrines and events of the fourth and later centuries (trinity of the godhead, double natures of Christ, consolidating and hierarchically structured catholic church) than by those of the first. Thirty years ago Rosemary Radford Ruether[3] had already pointed out that it was in the fourth century that Judaism and Christianity assumed the features by which they are known today.[4] To call Jesus a 'Jew' or a 'Christian', as these words are understood in the vernacular today, not only confuses the matter historically, but has led to disastrous social and inter-religious consequences. In the lexicon entry on Ἰουδαῖος in BDAG (2000, p. 478), Frederick Danker laments that

> incalculable harm has been caused by simply glossing Ἰ.[ουδαῖος] with 'Jew', for many readers or auditors of the Bible translations do not practice the historical judgment necessary to distinguish between circumstances and events of an ancient time and contemporary ethnic-religious-social realities, with the result that anti-Judaism in the modern sense of the term is needlessly fostered through biblical texts.[5]

Despite the growing number of scholars in agreement with these positions,[6] use of 'Jew' and 'Judaism' in reference to Israel and Israelites in the Second

2. See Jacob Neusner, *Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine: History, Messiah, Israel, and the Initial Confrontation* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. ix.

3. Rosemary Radford Ruether, 'Judaism and Christianity: Two Fourth-Century Religions', *Sciences Religieuses/Studies in Religion* 2 (1972), pp. 1-10.

4. Jewish scholar Daniel Boyarin (*Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999], p. 6) cites Ruether with approval and aptly describes both collectivities as 'twins in the womb' until the fourth century.

5. Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon on the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd rev. edn, 2000), p. 478 sub Ἰουδαῖος.

6. See A.T. Kraabel, 'The Roman Synagogue: Six Disputable Assumptions', *JJS* 33 (1982), pp. 445-64; Robert J. Miller (ed.), *The Complete Gospels: Annotated Scholars Version* (Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1992); Bruce J. Malina, *Windows on the World of Jesus* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), p. xv; Richard A. Horsley, 'The Death of Jesus', in Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 395-422 (398); idem, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995); Helmut Koester, 'The Historical Jesus and the Historical Situation of the Quest: An Epilogue', in Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 535-46 (541-42); idem, 'Historic Mistakes Haunt the Relationship of Christianity and Judaism', *Biblical Archaeological Review* 21.2 (1995), pp. 26-27;

Temple period and use of 'Christian' and 'Christianity' in reference to Jesus and his earliest followers continue unabated in both professional and lay circles. In the hope that an extensive review of the evidence might help to persuade those still straddling the linguistic fence, I offer the following study of terminological usage in the first century followed by recommendations regarding preferred usage today.

The Principles and Practice of (Self-)Identification

It will be useful at the outset to clarify key characteristics of how people identify themselves and others, as noted by sociolinguists and social identity theorists,[7] and how this information might guide our research.

1. The process of identification and self-identification is an issue of classification and categorization. As with all classification, it is essential to be clear on *who* is doing the classifying, according to what *criteria*, and for what *purposes*. This principle is necessary to follow in order to avoid imposing on the ancient sources alien and unfitting modern categories or calling camels 'tanks' because a present general is familiar with tanks but not camels. This principle is an example of the anthropological and ethnographic practice of distinguishing 'emic' from 'etic' categories for the sake of analytical clarity. 'Emic' is the designation for information as it is supplied by the language, thought categories, perspectives and worldviews of the ancient native informers and their culture. 'Etic' categories and terminology, on the other hand, are those of the modern investigating social scientist. 'Jesus groups', for example, is a useful etic designation, despite its

---

John H. Elliott, 'Jesus was neither a "Jew" nor a "Christian": Dangers of Inappropriate Nomenclature' (paper delivered at the International Meeting of the Context Group, Prague, Czech Republic, 21–24 May 1997); John H. Elliott, *1 Peter: A New Translation and Commentary* (AB, 37B; New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 6; John J. Pilch, 'Are There Jews and Christians in the Bible?', *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 53 (1997), pp. 119-25; John J. Pilch, 'Jews and Christians', in idem, *The Cultural Dictionary of the Bible* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), pp. 98-104; Philip F. Esler, *Galatians* (New Testament Readings; London and New York: Routledge, 1998), p. 4; Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), pp. 62-74; Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 32-34; Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), pp. 44-46.

7. Esler, *Romans*, presents a comprehensive overview of social identity theory (pp. 19-39) and research on ethnicity (pp. 40-76). These chapters provide a theoretical framework for the examination of nomenclature in particular and the points that I shall be listing here. Where Esler cites (*Galatians*) and provides further substantiation (*Romans*) of my work, he is referring to the material contained in my 1997 paper.

non-appearance in the ancient sources,[8] for it provides a neutral term that focuses our attention on the social character and dynamic aspect of Jesus's community-forming activity. Eventually the scientist or exegete may reorganize the emic data into fresh interpretive patterns and provide new names such as 'Jesus movement' or 'negative reference group' and the like. But first she must know the language and terms of the native informants as this discourse reflects their conceptual categories, categories shaped in turn by their economic, social, political and cultural experience. In accord with this methodological principle, we will ask, 'what are the terms that the ancient biblical communities and their contemporaries used to identify themselves and others?' 'According to which characteristics were identifications made in antiquity and how are they evident in the discourse of these groups?'

In the ancient world, groups and persons identified themselves and others primarily in terms of family, lineage, tribe or *ethnos*, and with respect to place of birth, origin and upbringing.[9] Each category of bloodline and locality will have specific features that express or highlight certain characteristics of the group. Jesus is identified as 'son of Joseph', for instance, or as 'Jesus of Nazareth of Galilee'. Paul claims to be 'an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin'.

2. The study of nomenclature must attend to, and ascertain where possible, *who is speaking to whom and under what circumstances*. This is necessary because terms of identification and self-identification will vary, dependent upon speaker, audience and context.

3. As a corollary of number two, it is also necessary to distinguish *insider* from *outsider* language, speakers and audiences, since, as sociolinguists[10] and social psychologists have established, insiders often employ different vocabulary when speaking to fellow insiders than when addressing outsiders. This includes different nomenclature of identification and self-identification.[11] In my racially-mixed neighborhood of Oakland, California, I, a Caucasian, would never think

8. On emic and etic and the utility of the distinction see John H. Elliott, *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp. 37-40, 129.

9. As illustrated in detail by Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996).

10. For example, M.A.K. Halliday, *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning* (Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978). See also the instructive discussions of labeling theory by Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988), pp. 33-131; Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, 'Conflict in Luke–Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory', in Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke–Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), pp. 97-122.

11. The failure to grasp this vital social-scientific distinction limits the utility of Graham Harvey's useful collection of data, *The True Israel: Use of the Names Jew, Hebrew, and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (AGJU, 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

of calling any of my African American neighbors 'nigger'. But these very neighbors, and especially the teenagers, have no hesitation in calling each other 'nigger' as in the expression, 'we're dumb ass niggas in this shit together. But don't let on to the Crackers'. African Americans born in the 1920s, '30s and '40s of course don't say 'nigga' but 'Negro'. Most African Americans in my neighborhood also talk about persons like Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice as 'Oreos' who also 'have stopped operating on CPT'. And if you, reader, don't understand, you realize that you're an outsider who is not supposed to. This insider–outsider distinction is important when considering the use and implications of the names Ἰουδαῖος and Ἰσραηλίτης, the former being an outsider term, as we shall see, and the latter being an insider self-designation.

4. Linguists and anthropologists have noted that nomenclature used by outsiders for groups other than themselves is often resisted or rejected by the thus-labeled groups, or accepted only after the passage of much time, sometimes a generation or more. This is particularly the case when the outgroup, from a position of power, superiority and control, imposes its will, language and terminology on its subjects. These principles are relevant to the situation in Judaea, and indeed the entire Mediterranean, in the Hellenistic and Roman periods of domination. Along with its language, the nomenclature of the victor became that of the vanquished.

5. The names and terms used by social groups to identify themselves and other groups are part of a process of self-definition, a process involving a group's asserting its own character and being, and distinguishing and demarcating it from the character and being of other groups.[12] This involves an underlying perception of an 'us' distinguished from a 'them' (or other 'thems'), of ingroups and outgroups. Who 'we' are is defined not only in terms of our family roots, the group or groups of which we are a part, our personal qualities and what we do, but also in terms of what we are not, 'not-them', not sharing 'their' view of the world, 'their' interests and loyalties, 'their food', 'their' customs. Terms of self-identification are group-specific, speaker- and audience-specific, and will vary in use and nuance as discoursing partners vary and as circumstances of discourse change.

6. In collectivist, group-oriented cultures like those of antiquity, groups speaking of other groups regularly generalize and homogenize 'the others', using one collective term to embrace all—ignorant of, or unconcerned with, any distinctions or labels made by group members among themselves. One social entity's 'us-versus-them' distinction was *we* 'Hellenes' as the civilized who speak Greek and lived cultured lives versus *them*, the uncultured babbling 'barbarians'

12. Beside Esler, *Romans*, see also Esler, *Galatians*, pp. 40-57 on the processes of self-identification as guided by the work of social identity theorists such as Henri Taifel, Serge Moscovici, Michael Hogg, Dominic Abrams and John Turner.

(βάρβαροι). The Israelites likewise conceived of themselves as *we*, the people of YHWH, contrasted to *them*, the *goiim* or *ethnê* or *nationes*. The 'them' was equivalent to Everyone Else.

7. Such generalizations allow for stereotyping other groups on the basis of the conventional principle, 'you know one of them, you know them all'. You know one Cretan, you know them all: they're all liers. You know one Pharisee, you know them all. They're a brood of hypocritical vipers. You know one Judaean, you know them all. They observe one day in seven without working, eat no swine flesh, mutilate the tips of their male infants and journey regularly to their Temple in Jerusalem of Judaea where they expect to meet their God and pay for its upkeep with their temple taxes. Sadducees are all dastard Epicurians (*apikorim* in the Mishnah).You know one Galilean, you know them all—*amme ha-eretz* in the eyes of the rigorists, and rabble rousers one and all.

8. Ingroup members, when referring to themselves, are savvy to ingroup distinctions and discrete classifiers. In the mind of Pontius Pilate and his soldiers, the troublesome inhabitants of Syria-Palestine were all *Ioudaioi* somehow connected with *Ioudaia* and its Temple. Insider Israelites, on the other hand, members of the House of Israel, would never confuse Judaea with Galilee or let a Galilean brogue go undetected. In regard to those outside the pale of Israel, however, Israelites stereotyped with the best of them, regarding all *goiim*[13] or *Hellênes* as lascivious and immoral idolaters.

9. As audiences change, a speaker's choice of self-identifiers will change. When identifying themselves to outgroups, persons often use nomenclature that they believe their audience will understand or they employ terms by which the outsider audience names or labels them, even if these identifiers are not used within the group. This concession could be deference to those who 'call the shots and set the terms', both linguistic and socio-political. It is also a matter of expediency for the sake of clear and concise communication when no disputes over identity are at stake. When speaking among themselves, the native American Sioux or Chippawa or Mohegans or Hopi would never refer to themselves as 'Indians', let alone as 'redskin' or 'savages' (the demeaning labels of 'paleface' outsiders). When interacting with 'the white man', however, they would answer to the label 'Indian' simply because it was the term dictated by the one holding the gun and calling the shots.

10. Stereotyping, hegemonic mis-identification, disrespect and conflict are minimized by identifying individuals and groups by those names which they

13. On the ethnocentric character of this designation see Christopher D. Stanley, '"Neither Jew nor Greek": Ethnic Conflict in Greco-Roman Society', *JSNT* 64 (1996), pp. 101-124: 'Those whom the Jews [*sic*] lumped together as "Gentiles" would have defined themselves as "Greeks", "Romans", "Phrygians", "Galatians", "Cappadocians", and members of various other ethnic populations' (p. 105).

prefer for identifying themselves. This is the procedure followed, for example, in the USA or South Africa when persons of European origin refer to the indigenous inhabitants by their tribal names. These preferred ingroup identifiers will generally be the names most redolent of the history, sacred traditions and practices of the ingroups.

11. Terms of identification and self-identification also change over time and not infrequently can vary from one geo-cultural region to another. The study of such terms, therefore, must keep an eye out for such change and variation and consider the reasons, conditions and consequences of such change. Today's 'African American' was yesterday's 'Black woman' who was previously a 'Negro' after being slurred by Georgians as a 'Niggra' or 'darkie'. Yesterday's color-coded 'white man' is today's regionally classified 'Caucasian'. 'Honkeys' in the US North are 'Crackers' in the South. The 'nigger' in Mississippi was the 'kafir' in Pretoria. The 'Bosch' of World War I became the 'Krauts' of World War II.

With these analytical guidelines clarified, we can now turn to the situation of antiquity and consider how Jesus, his compatriots and his followers were identified in the first-century sources, how they identified themselves, and then how we today should best identify them. In the remarks that follow, I will review evidence concerning key names or expressions used in the New Testament and related sources to identify Jesus, his disciples and their contemporaries. I will then show that specific terms of our current nomenclature are inaccurate, and deny advances in our understanding of ancient social relations within and beyond Israel of the first several centuries of the Common Era. When enshrined in inaccurate Bible translations these erroneous terms mislead ordinary Bible readers and promote not only historical misunderstanding but, worse, fan the fires of anti-Semitism. These remarks will add support, social perspective, and perhaps a few new reasons for eliminating our inaccurate terminology and replacing it with better language.

Jesus was Not a 'Jew'

Jesus, of course, was not a 'Christian'. The term had not yet been invented and once invented would never have made sense if applied to Jesus. Consequently he is never called 'Christian' in the sources and we should not do so either. When and how often in the first century his followers were named 'Christians' is another matter which we shall consider anon.

Let us begin with the fact that Jesus was not a Ἰουδαῖος. This is a more complicated and controverted issue, involving, as it does, the heated debate over the lexical meaning and use of the term *Ioudaios* and its preferred translation—'Jew' or 'Judaean'.

There is no direct evidence indicating how Jesus identified himself—to fellow Israelites or to outsiders, though some indirect evidence is at hand, which we shall mention below. In terms of *how he was identified by others*, the New Testament evidence can be summarized as follows:

Aside from the so-called 'messianic titles' or ideological labels, Jesus customarily was identified, as were his contemporaries, according to family, lineage, tribe or *ethnos*, on the one hand, or according to place of birth, origin, upbringing and activity, on the other. This was in accord with conventional practice of identification in the collectivist, group-oriented world of antiquity. This practice, along with thinking and classifying in terms of stereotypes, has been discussed by Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey in various studies.[14] Thus, in the New Testament Jesus is identified in terms of (a) his parents,[15] siblings[16] and lineage.[17] In terms of his family and lineage, Jesus was *Yeshua bar Yosef*, of the house of David (Mt. 1.1), of the tribe of Judah (Mt. 1.2-3), of the house of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Mt. 1.1, 2).

Or he is identified in terms of (b) his birthplace, geographical origin and place of activity. Thus he is depicted as 'Jesus of/from Galilee' (*apo tês Galilaias*, Mt. 3.13) or 'from Nazareth of Galilee' (*apo Nazareth tês Galilaias* (Mt. 21.11; 27.55; Mk 1.9) or as 'Jesus the Galilean' (*ho Galilaios*, Mt. 26.69).[18]

Galilee was the chief locale of Jesus' activity,[19] the locale of Jesus' parents

14. See Malina and Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names*; Malina and Neyrey, 'First Century Personality: Dyadic, Not Individualistic', in Neyrey, *Social World of Luke–Acts*, pp. 67-96; Malina and Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul*, pp. 10-18, 23-63, 64-99, 117-20, 150-51, 154-76.

15. See 'son of Joseph' (Jn 6.52), 'Jesus of/from Nazareth, son of Joseph' (Jn 1.45; cf. Mt. 1.16, 18-21); or 'son of Mary' (Mk 6.3); cf. Mt. 1.18-25; 2.11; 13.55; Lk. 1.26-56; 2.5-7, 34; John 2.12; Acts 1.14.

16. See Mk 6.3; cf. Mt. 13.55. See also Jn 2.12; 7.3, 5, 10; 20.17; Acts 1.14; 1 Cor. 9.5.

17. See 'son of David' (Mt. 1.1; 9.27; 20.30, 31; 21.9, 15; cf. Rom. 1.3); 'son of Abraham' (Mt. 1.1); for lineage see also the genealogies of Mt. 1.2-17 and Lk. 3.23-38; cf. also Gal. 3.16.

18. This is on the lips of a Judaean slave girl. His identity as Galilean is also implied in Lk. 23.6 and Jn 4.45; 7.52.

19. See Mk 1.14, 16, 28, 39; 14.28; 15.41; 16.7; Mt. 4.12-24; 15.29; 17.22; 19.1; 26.32; 28.7, 10; Lk. 4.14, 31, 44; 23.5, 6, 55; Jn 1.43; 2.1, 11; 4.3, 43, 45-47, 54; 61; 7.1, 9; Acts 10.37; 13.31; implicitly, see Mk 14.70; Lk. 5.17; 8.26; 17.11; 23.49, 55; Jn 7.41, 52 *bis.* On Galilee see, *inter alios*, Sean Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 BCE to 135 CE: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980); Sean Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 2000); Willibald Bösen, *Galiläa als Lebensraum und Wirkungsfeld Jesu* (Freiburg: Herder, 1985). For a recent overview of research on Galilee and Galilee as context of Jesus' activity, see Jens Schröter, 'Jesus aus Galiläa. Die Herkunft Jesu und ihre Bedeuting für das Verständnis seiner Wirksamkeit', in Santiago Guijarro Oporto (ed.), *Los comienzos del cristianismo: IV Simposio del Grupo Europeo de Investigación sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo* (Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 2006), pp. 23-42; see also Douglas E. Oakman, 'Models and Archaeology in the Social Interpretation of Jesus', in John P. Pilch (ed.), *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the*

and family,[20] and the locale of Jesus' first followers.[21] Simon Peter is twice identified as a 'Galilean'.[22] Thus, of the sixty-one New Testament occurrences of *Galilaia* in the New Testament, the vast majority of instances identify Jesus, his family and followers as from, or active in, Galilee. Of the eleven New Testament occurrences of the related adjective or substantive *Galilaios*, most also are of Jesus and his followers.[23]

A related geographical identification is his being *of/from Nazareth*:

(a) 'Jesus of/from Nazareth'[24]

(b) 'Jesus of/from Nazareth of Galilee'[25]

(c) 'Jesus the Nazarene (*Nazarênos, Nazôraios*)': All six of the NT occurrences of *Nazarênos* modify Jesus.[26] Of the thirteen NT occurrences of *Nazôraios*, twelve modify Jesus[27] and one identifies his followers as 'the party of the Nazarenes' (Acts 24.5).

The creedal expressions of Acts identifying Jesus as *Nazôraios* (2.22; 3.6; 4.10) are ancient and consistent in their formulation. This reveals an ancient and consistent identification of Jesus, his family, and his initial followers with the localities of Galilee and Nazareth[28] but not Judaea. Jesus and his followers were said to have visited Judaea, but they were never called Ἰουδαῖοι by fellow insiders.

Naturally all these identifications would have certain notions and stereotypes associated with them, as was customary in a world where collective identity and

---

Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina (Biblical Interpretation Series, 53; Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 102-131. On Jesus the Galilean, see most recently Sean Freyne, *Jesus, a Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus-Story* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

20. See Lk. 1.26; 2.4; 2.39; cf. Mk 6.1-6a/Mt. 13.54-58.

21. See e.g. Mk 1.16-20 par; 2.13-15 par.; 3.13-19; 16.7/Mt. 28.7, 10, 16; Lk. 5.1-11; 23.49, 55; 24.6; Jn 1.43-51; 12.21; 21.2-23; Acts 1.11; 2.7; 9.31; 13.31. On Jesus' Galilean followers see most recently Santiago Guijarro, 'Los primeros Discípulos de Jesús en Galilea,' in Santiago Guijarro (ed.), *Los comienzos del cristianismo. IV Simposio del Grupo Europeo de Investigación sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo* (Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 2006), pp. 71-91.

22. See Mk 14.70 (and by implication, Mt. 26.69) and Lk. 22.59; cf. also Jn 21.1-23.

23. See Mt. 26.69; Mk 14.70; Lk. 22.59; 23.6; Jn 4.45; Acts 1.11; 2.7. Four other times 'Galilean' designates pilgrims from Galilee (Lk. 13.1, 2 *bis*) or 'Judas the Galilean' (Acts 5.37), rebel leader and illustration of the association of Galilee and the Galileans with resistance and rebellion; cf. Josephus, *Ant*. 18.23.

24. See John 1.45; Acts 10.38. For Jesus at Nazareth see also Mt. 4.13; Lk. 4.16; Jn 1.46. For Jesus' family (and Jesus) at Nazareth see Mt. 2.23; Lk. 1.26; 2.4, 39, 51; 4.16; Jn 1.46.

25. See Mt. 21.11; Mk 1.11; Acts 10.38.

26. See Mk 1.24/Lk. 4.34; Mk 10.47; 14.67; 16.6; Lk. 24.19.

27. See Mt. 2.23; 26.71; Lk. 18.37; Jn 18.5, 7; 19.19; Acts 2.22; 3.6; 4.10; 6.14; 22.8; 26.9.

28. So also Bösen, *Galiläa*, pp. 110-45 on Jesus and Nazareth.

group orientation was the norm and where people were known by the parents who bore them, the place they grew up and the company they kept.[29] In a series of brilliant studies, Halvor Moxnes has analyzed Galilee not only as the historical site of Jesus' upbringing and activity, but also as a frequently varying construct of modern exegesis from the Enlightenment to the present.[30] He has shown how *Galilee* was an ideologically loaded concept not only for Jesus and his contemporaries but for all generations since. The same, of course, could and should be shown about *Judaea* and *Judaeans*.

The only exceptions to Jesus' never being called Ἰουδαῖος in the New Testament are three occasions where he is said to be called Ἰουδαῖος by *outsiders*, namely by the Persian Magi who refer to the infant Jesus as 'king of the Ἰουδαίων' according to Matthew (2.2), by the Samaritan woman of John 4.1-42, who mistakenly identifies Jesus (coming from the territory of Judaea) as a *Judaean* (Ἰουδαῖος, 4.9), and by the Romans who executed him (Mt. 27.37/Mk 15.26/Lk. 23.38/Jn 19.19). The formulation of the Magi, while conceivable if the episode itself is historical, also can be seen as consistent with the scenario narrated by Matthew. Since Jesus, according to Matthew, was born in Bethlehem of Judaea (2.1), supposedly in accord with prophetic expectation (2.5-6, where Matthew modified the quoted text of Mic. 5.2 to fit the situation of Jesus' birth), the Magi sought him out in Judaea, the place of his birth, and assumed that he was then 'born king of the Judaeans'. The narrative context also best explains why the Samaritan woman in Jn 4.9 would say to Jesus who requests of her a drink, 'How is it that you, a Ἰουδαῖος, ask a drink of me, a Samaritan woman?' Jesus, according to the narrator, is leaving Judea and heading north to Galilee (4.3; cf. 4.43-45). In passing through Samaria, he meets a Samaritan woman at Jacob's well near Sychar (4.4-7). Because of his movement from Judea northward, she naturally mistakes him to be a Judaean and addresses him as such. Given John's awareness of, and repeated identification of, Jesus and his followers as 'Galileans' or 'Nazarenes',[31] Graham Harvey's claim that the identification of Jesus as a Ἰουδαῖος in Jn 4.9 is part of John's overall strategy of depicting Jesus as a Judaean (and indeed also as a 'Jew')[32] fails to convince.[33]

29. On stereotyping as typical habit see Malina and Neyrey, 'First Century Personality', pp. 74-76; Malina and Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul*, pp. 3-4, 117-20, 150-51, 169-74.

30. See the two-part series of Halvor Moxnes's articles, 'The Construction of Galilee as a Place for the Historical Jesus—Part I', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31.1 (2001), pp. 26-37; 'The Construction of Galilee as a Place for the Historical Jesus—Part II', *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31.2 (2001), pp. 64-77 and his book-length study, *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom*(Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003).

31. Jesus: Jn 1.43, 45; 2.1, 11; 4.3, 43, 45-47, 54, 61; 7.1, 9, 52; 18.5, 7; 19.19; implicitly, 7.41, 52; Jesus' followers: Jn 1.43-51; 12.21; 21.1-23; implicitly, see also 7.52.

32. Harvey, *The True Israel*, pp. 84-94 (89).

It is quite noteworthy that the Passion accounts of all four Gospels differentiate the terminologies of insiders and outsiders and the expressions 'king of the Ἰουδαίων' and 'king of *Israel*'. Pilate is described as having inquired of Jesus whether he was 'the king of the Ἰουδαίων' (Mk 15.2/Mt. 27.11/Jn 18.33), as having referred to Jesus indirectly as 'king of the Ἰουδαίων' (Mk 15.12), and as having written as the charge against Jesus, 'the king of the Ἰουδαίων' (Mk 15.26); cf. Lk. 23.38 ('this is the king of the Ἰουδαίων'); Mt. 27.37 ('this is Jesus, the king of the Ἰουδαίων'); Jn 19.19 ('Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Ἰουδαίων'). The Roman military detail carrying out the execution is said to have mocked him with the same expression, 'Hail, king of the Ἰουδαίων' (Mk 15.18/Mt. 27.29/Jn 19.3). This expression, 'king of the Ἰουδαίων', found in all four Gospels, has a firm claim on historical authenticity and is fully consistent with the Roman use of *Judaei* to designate the inhabitants of the territory they knew as *Judaea*.[34] Nomenclature of the Gospels indicating how the evangelists reported the language of Roman outsiders is consistent with how the *Romans* themselves classified Jesus; namely as a Ἰουδαῖος among a people they named Ἰουδαῖοι/*Judaei.* This identifier fit exactly with the name by which these Romans called the land of residence of the Ἰουδαῖοι/*Judaei*, namely *Judaea* (as in the series of *Judaea capta* coins minted in celebration of the Roman conquest of Judaea in 70 CE).

Whereas Pilate and the Roman soldiers are reported to have identified Jesus as 'king of the Ἰουδαίων', his fellow Israelites spoke of him as (would-be) 'king of *Israel*'. The chief priests and the scribes mocked Jesus with the words, 'Let the Christ, the *king of Israel*, come down now from the cross, that we may see and believe' (Mk 15.32/Mt. 27.42). The noteworthy and consistent contrast in the languages recorded of, or ascribed to, Romans and Israelites demonstrates the difference between insider and outsider language for Jesus as reported by the evangelists.[35] Even though reports of the evangelists are second-hand, the language is consistent with the patterns of usage documented elsewhere for both Romans and Israelites. These instances from the Passion narratives belong to an

---

33. In regard to the sense of *Ioudaios* in John, Frederick Danker (BDAG [2000], pp. 478-79) also aptly observes that 'there is no indication that John uses the term in the general ethnic sense suggested in modern use of the word "Jew", which covers diversities of belief and practice that were not envisaged by biblical writers, who concern themselves with intra-Judaean (intra-Israelite) differences and conflicts'.

34. The substantive *Judaei* was based on the adjective *Judaeus*, meaning 'of, belonging to Judaea'. For *Judaea*, see e.g. Pliny, *Nat. Hist*. 5.14.15; Suetonius, *Tib*. 4; Tacitus, *Hist*. 2.79; 5.9 and the series of *Judaea capta* coins minted by Vespasian in announcement of the Roman conquest of Judaea in 70 CE. For *Judaeus* as substantive, Horace, *Serm*. 1.5.100; Juvenal, *Sat*. 6.547; 3.18; Tacitus, *Hist*. 5.2 and *passim*.

35. This distinction of usage mirrors that found, e.g., in the book of Judith where *Ioudaios* is used by outsiders and *Israel*, by insiders.

array of evidence illustrating the preference for the names 'Israel' and 'Israelite' as self-identifiers when ingroup Israelites are addressing one another. This nomenclature is also found in Jn 12.13 where Jesus, arriving in Jerusalem, is hailed by the crowd of Judaeans with the words, '"Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, the *king of Israel*"' and Jn 1.50 where Nathanael, a Galilean, acclaims Jesus to be 'the *king of Israel*'. This practice, so amply illustrated in the Old Testament, numerous parabiblical writings, and the rabbinic writings, was familiar to, and followed by, the New Testament authors as well. 'Sons of Israel' and 'house of Israel' are the chief collective terms for the people joined by covenant, Torah, and cult to the God YHWH. Even in the post-exilic period when only the tribe of Judah remained, 'Israel', not 'Judah' or 'people of Judah' was the preferred collective term of self-designation. This preference continued through and beyond the New Testament period.

It was in the post-exilic era that another term, Ἰουδαῖος, was coined by Greek-speaking outsiders to identify residents of Judah/*Y*^{e}*hud*, returnees from the Babylonian exile who had settled the administrative area around Jerusalem (Neh. 5.14). The first attestation of Ἰουδαῖος appears in the speech of an outsider Greek, Clearchus (fourth to third century BCE),[36] a pupil of Aristotle, who observed concerning a certain Ἰουδαῖος:

The man was a Ἰουδαῖος of Coele-Syria. These people are descended from the Indian philosophers. The philosophers, they say, are called Calani by the residents of India, and Ἰουδαῖοι[37] by the residents of Syria (παρὰ δὲ Σύροις) for the district that they inhabit is known as Ἰουδαία.

This awareness of the connection of the name Ἰουδαῖοι to tribe and territory remained alive for centuries, as Josephus, among others, attests. Recounting the return of the Judahites from Babylonian exile, Josephus explains that Ἰουδαῖοι, 'the name by which they have been called from the time when they went up from Babylon, is derived from the tribe of Judah (Ἰούδα) as this tribe was the first to come to those parts; both the people themselves and the country have taken their name from it' (*Ant*. 11.173). Ἰουδαία, in turn, he describes as the area where Jerusalem and the Temple of the God of the Israelites are located

36. Clearchus, frg. 6, in Josephus, *Apion* 1.179. For other Greek references see Walter Gutbrod, 'Ἰουδαῖος, Ἰσραήλ, Ἑβραῖος in Greek Hellenistic Literature', *TDNT* 3 (1965), pp. 369-91 (369-71). Josephus also mentions histories of the *Ioudaioi* written and quoted by Gentiles, such as Alexander Polyhistor's citation from the 'History of the *Ioudaioi*' by Cleodomus the prophet (Josephus, *Ant*. 1.240).

37. Its gentilic ending (*-aios*) suggests that underlying *Ioudaios* was an Aramaic original denoting the inhabitants of Judah, *y*^{e}*hudai* (ending in *-ai*), a possibility that Clearchus's comment also supports. For the equivalent Hebrew *y*^{e}*hudi* see 2 Kgs 16.16; Jer 32.12. The Aramaic *y*^{e}*hudai* was the standard self-designation of the Judahites residing on the Nile island of Elephantine (K. G. Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ, Ἰουδαῖος, Ἑβραῖος in Jewish Literature after the OT', *TDNT* 3 [1965], pp. 359-69, esp. 364-65).

(*Ant*. 11.4), encompassing some three million arouae of fertile soil (*Apion* 1.195). Noteworthy here is both the identification of Judea through reference to Jerusalem and the Temple and the identification of the deity as 'the God of the *Israelites*' rather than 'God of the *Judaeans*' as might be expected in this context.[38] In actuality, the latter expression appears nowhere in Josephus. In this expression, 'Israelites' is the traditional term of self-reference, not 'Judaeans'.

When Ἰουδαῖος is used in reference to inhabitants of Judaea, how one envisioned the scope and extent of Judaea determined whom one considered to be Judaeans/Ἰουδαῖοι. Concerning Judaea, the geographer Strabo notes that 'the interior above Phoenicia as far as the Arabs, between Gaza and Antilebanon, is called Judaea' (*Geography* 16.2.21). Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 5.12.13 §66) lists *Judaea* as one of the several divisions of Syria, along with *Palestina*, *Coele*, and *Phoenica*, *Damascena, Babylonia*, etc. 'Beyond Idumaea and Samaria', he notes, 'stretches the wide expanse of Judaea. The part of Judaea adjoining Syria is called Galilee, Peraea adjoins Arabia and Egypt, and the rest of Judaea is divided into ten toparchies' (*Nat. Hist*. 5.15 §70). These outsider descriptions have a 'greater Judaea' in view, with Judaea virtually equivalent to all of Palestine. On the other hand, a Judaea of narrower scope is evident in the Septuagint and most of the New Testament references where Ἰουδαία designates only 'the southern part of Palestine in contrast to Samaria, Galilee, Perea, and Idumea' (BDAG 477-478). Josephus also distinguished Judaea (*War* 1.371) from Galilee (*War* 1.134) as well as from Samaria, Idumaea and Peraea (e.g. *War* 2.43, 96; *Ant*. 20.118; *Life* 269);[39] and describes the territory as a district of Coele-Syria (*Apion* 1.179).

Whatever the extent of Judaea, 'Judaean', not 'Jew' or 'Jewish', is the appropriate translation of Ἰουδαῖος as an inhabitant of Ἰουδαία.[40] Its Latin equivalent is *Judaeus* (as adjective and substantive).[41] The translation of Tacitus's *Histories* by Clifford H. Moore in the Loeb Classical Library series is illustrative of the misimpression created when 'Jewish' rather than 'Judaean' is used to translate the adjective *Judaeus*. Tacitus' description of Judaea (*Histories* 5.6-8) mentions

38. Josephus, *Ant*. 11.123-30, reporting a letter of the Persian Xerxes to Ezra, involves a similar juxtaposition of *Ioudaioi* and 'God of the Israelites': Xerxes commands *Ioudaioi* intent on going up to Jerusalem to 'look after matters in Judaea in accordance with the law of God, and bring to *the God of the Israelites* the gifts that I and my friends have vowed to send'. The expression 'the God of the Israelites', while most untypical of outsider parlance, is traditional Israelite phraseology and undoubtedly derives from Josephus, not Xerxes.

39. Accordingly he also distinguished Judaeans from Galileans and Samaritans (Josephus, *Ant*. 9.61; 20.118-36; *Life* 221; 382-83).

40. Context is one indication of when *Ioudaios* identified an inhabitant of Judaea, as when *Ioudaios* is juxtaposed to *Ioudaia*; see Josephus, *Ant*. 11.60-61; 13.24; 15.406; 18.2; 19.366; *War* 2.184-85; 187.

41. Tacitus illustrates Roman customary nomenclature, where the name *Judaei* designated not only the contemporary residents of Judaea but also their earliest ancestors (*Hist.* 5.1-13).

a river of Judaea emptying into a sea: *at Belus amnis Iudaico mari inlabitur* (*Hist*. 5.7). This is oddly rendered as 'The river Belus empties into the *Jewish* Sea'. This sea, alias the Salt Sea or Dead Sea, is no more a 'Jewish' sea than Judaea is 'Jewishland'.

Although the term Ἰουδαῖος was first used of the residents of Judea in the Persian period by outsiders and not by the residents themselves, eventually it was also adopted as a self-designation by the Judaean natives. Thereafter, the range of Ἰουδαῖος was extended to apply to all persons and groups who were bound ethnically, politically, economically, socially and culturally to Judaea, Jerusalem and its Temple (and Temple tax), and observance of Torah.[42] Not only outsiders but also insiders gradually began using the term in this extended sense. This broadening of usage is noticeable in the Septuagint, in which there are approximately 220 occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος. In sixty-one instances it translates Hebrew terms of the *y^{e}hud-* root, which identify members of the tribe of Judah or residents in the land of Judah. It occurs far more frequently in the later Apocryphal writings (154×) where it is employed mainly in the regional sense for residents of Judah/Judaea[43] but occasionally in the wider sense as well. While the size and borders of Judah/Judaea varied over the post-exilic centuries, this territory was always the location of the holy city Jerusalem and of the Temple, the chief markers and orientation points, along with Torah observance, of Judaeans wherever located. The numerous juxtapositions of Ἰουδαῖος with Ἰουδαία illustrate the conventional association in antiquity of the name of the people and their place of residence (*Galilaios* with *Galilaia*, *Hellên* with *Hellas*, *Rômaios* with *Rômê*, *Nazôraios* with *Nazareth*, *Kyprios* with *Kypros*, *Kyrênaios* with *Kyrênê*, *Thessalonikeus* with *Thessalinikê*, *Philippêsios* with *Philippoi* etc.).This suggests that even when Ἰουδαῖος was used without an accompanying reference to Ἰουδαία, the connection of persons to place was potentially implied. 'Diaspora Jews [*sic*]', J.D.G. Dunn notes, 'continued to identify themselves by reference to Judaea, their country of origin, and this state of affairs presumably continued at least so long as the Jerusalem Temple still stood and diaspora Jews continued to attest their identification with it by paying the Temple Tax'.[44]

Philo and Josephus display similar bi-fold usage.[45] Josephus identifies himself as a 'Hebrew' (*War.* 1.3) and as a Ἰουδαῖος (*Ant*. 1.4), in the latter instance when

42. On Ἰουδαῖος see BDAG, pp. 478-79; Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ', pp. 359-65; Gutbrod, 'Ἰουδαῖος', pp. 369-71, and the sources listed by H. Kuhli, 'Ἰουδαῖος', *EDNT* 2 (1991), pp. 193-97 (193-94).

43. The narrative contexts make this clear; see also the juxtapositions of *Ioudaia* and *Ioudaioi* as in 1 Macc. 11.33-34.

44. James D.G. Dunn, 'Who Did Paul Think He Was? A Study of Jewish-Christian Identity', *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999), pp. 174-93 (180).

45. See Gutbrod, 'Ἰουδαῖος', p. 371.

referring to the 'war that we Ἰουδαῖοι waged against the Romans'. Both names are juxtaposed in *Ant*. 1.146 and elsewhere. References to Ἰουδαία and Ἰουδαῖοι appear far more often in the books of the *Antiquities* recounting post-exilic history (Books 11–20) than in those covering the previous centuries (Books 1–10) where 'Israel', 'Israelites' and 'Hebrews' are Josephus's preferred names for the people. In Book 11, as already noted, he explains the origin of the name Ἰουδαῖος as linked with the tribal name 'Judah'. Elsewhere he identifies as Ἰουδαῖοι persons referred to by the Greek outsider Herodotus as circumcised 'Palestinian Syrians' (Σύρους τοὺς ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ).[46] While he also identifies as Ἰουδαῖοι persons living beyond Judaea, the name still may connote a connection of those so named with the land of Ἰουδαία, implicitly,[47] if not explicitly.[48] On the one hand, he can speak of Galilee as 'the territory of the Ἰουδαῖοι' and of the residents of Galilee as Ἰουδαῖοι (*War* 1.21; 2.232). On the other, he can also designate persons as 'Galilean',[49] meaning inhabitants of Galilee; he can distinguish Galileans from Judaeans,[50] and he can refer to himself as distinct from the Judaeans.[51] In the case of both Philo and Josephus, the fact that they both were reckoning with outsiders as a portion or predominant part of their audiences would explain their use of *Ioudaios* in its more encompassing sense. Josephus wrote for his Roman patrons and identified the land of the rebels and the rebels themselves as the Romans named them, *Judaea*/Ἰουδαία and *Judaei*/Ἰουδαῖοι. Whether Ἰουδαῖοι is used in the narrower regional or the broader ethnic sense, it is best translated as 'Judaean', not 'Jew'.[52]

Most of the occurrences in Philo are in *Flacc*. and *Legat*. Beside regular reference to the *Ioudaioi* of Judaea and Palestine, Josephus also mentions Ἰουδαῖοι at Rome [*War* 2.80-81 = *Ant*. 17.301; at Babylon [*Ant*. 15.14-15; *Life* 54]; Caesarea [*Life* 55]; Dicaearchia [*War 2*.103]; or towns of Syria [*War* 2.463]). See also his distinction of Judaea the home country from colonies of the dispersion as at Egypt and Babylon (*Apion* 32–33).

46. Josephus, *Apion* 1.169-71, referring to Herodotus, *History* 2.104.

47. When, for instance, Herod is called 'the king of the Ἰουδαῖοι' (*Ant.* 15.409; 16.311), he clearly is not being identified as king of all Ἰουδαῖοι the world over but only as ruler of the inhabitants of Judaea. Cf. also 'ethnarch of the Judaeans' (Josephus, *Ant*. 14.9, 36, 194-196, 200; cf. 'Simon…ethnarch of the Judaeans', 1 Macc. 14.47). When he speaks of a Ἰουδαῖος distant from his πάτρις, Judaea is most likely the πάτρις implied (*Apion* 2.277). The Ἰουδαῖοι seeking help from their fellow countrymen abroad are likewise Judaeans (*War* 1.5).

48. As in the collocations of Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἰουδαία; cf. e.g. *Ant*. 13.24; 15.406; 18.2; 19.366.

49. E.g. Judas 'the Galilean' (*War* 2.118, 433; 7.2.253; *Ant.* 18.4, 9, 23; 20.102), leader of fourth philosophy (*Ant*. 18.23-25).

50. Josephus, *Ant*. 17.254; cf. *War* 2.43.

51. *War* 3.130, 136, 142; *Life* 113, 416.

52. As Danker explains in BDAG and as now is the practice of a growing number of scholars; see above, n. 6. Esler (*Galatians*, p. 4), acknowledging the problems with 'Jew' and 'Judaism', agrees with Elliott ('Jesus was neither a "Jew" nor a "Christian"') in preferring as

Israelite Palestinian writings reveal a different practice.[53] Several of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of Palestinian provenance show no use of Ἰουδαῖος whatsoever.[54] In these writings the preference for 'Israel' as self-designation is clearly evident. The Qumran literature shows no use of *y^{e}hudi* or *y^{e}hudai* whatsoever. Here too 'Israel' is one of the most preferred self-designations (1QS 8.5, 9, 11; 1QSa 1.1, 6; CD 3.19 etc.). This preference for the name 'Israel' as self-designation continues in the Mishnah and other rabbinic writings where the word *Judaean* makes virtually no appearance. The terms *y^{e}hudi* or *y^{e}hudai* occur most rarely, and then in renderings of Gentile statements (*j. Seb.* 35b; *Gen. Rab.* 11 on 2.3). The few times this equivalent of Ἰουδαῖος does occur as a self-designation among Israelites (*m. Ned.* 11.2 [3×]; *b. Meg*. 13a), it appears to intentionally mimic 'the usage of non-Israelites or of the diaspora';[55] for *y^{e}hudot* [=Ἰουδαισμός] see only *Esther Rab*. 7.11. 'Israel' and 'House of Israel' are in this literature the standard and near exclusive terms of self-reference.

Thus use of Ἰουδαῖος as self-designation at the turn of the era was by no means universal and this is true of the Israelite diaspora as well. A second-century BCE inscription from the island of Delos indicates that certain persons there identified themselves as 'Israelites of Delos, who offer first fruits at sacred *Argarizein* [*Har Gerizim*]'. Their interest in Mount Gerizim shows them to be

---

designations 'Israel', 'Israelite', and suggests the adjective 'Judaic' in place of 'Jewish'. Subsequently he revised his position, presenting a comprehensive and cogent argument for 'Judaean' as the appropriate rendition of *Ioudaios* (*Romans*, pp. 63-74). Shaye J. D. Cohen (*The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* [Hellenistic Culture and Society, 31; Berkeley: University of California, 1999]) wishes to distinguish a 'religious' from a territorial sense of *Ioudaios* and to translate the latter as 'Judaean' but the former as 'Jew'. Esler (*Romans*, pp. 68-74) reveals the flawed assumptions underling this proposal and rightfully rejects it. Christopher Stanley (' "Neither Jew nor Greek": Ethnic Conflict in Greco-Roman Society', *JSNT* 64 [1996], pp. 101-124), stresses the ethnic, in contrast to religious, dimension of the names *Ioudaios* and *Hellên*, and demonstrates how the numerous conflicts between *Ioudaioi* and *Hellênes* around the Mediterranean world were fought on ethnic, not religious, terms. Alan F. Segal (*Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986]) favors using 'Judaean' in reference to *Ioudaios* prior to the fall of the Judaean state and 'Jew' thereafter. While the former is appropriate, the latter still remains anachronistic.

53. This is underlined by both Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ' and Kuhli, 'Ἰουδαῖος'.

54. This includes Tobit, Judith, Wis., Sirach, Ep. Jer., Song of the Three Young Men, *Prayer of Manasseh*, Psalms of Solomon, *Test. XII Patr.*, *4 Ezra*, *3 Enoch*. Philip F. Esler ('Ludic History in the Book of Judith: The Reinvention of Israelite Identity?' *BibInt* 10 [2002], pp. 107-143) provides an excellent analysis of the language of Judith from the vantage point of social identity theory.

55. Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ', p. 363; Kuhli, 'Ἰουδαῖος', p. 194. See also P.J. Tomson, 'The Names Israel and Jew in Ancient Judaism and in the New Testament', *Bijdragen, tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 47 (1986), pp. 120-40, 266-89, who views *Jehudith* in *m. Ket.* 7.6 as an outsider name for what insiders call Israel.

Samaritans, who nevertheless considered themselves members of the people of Israel.[56]

This overview of usage squares with what Karl Georg Kuhn and Walter Gutbrod concluded over half a century ago.[57] Distinguishing already between insider and outsider usage, and between the usage of 'Palestinian Israel' and 'Hellenistic Judaism', they found that 'Israel' was the most common self-designation of the former[58] and Ἰουδαῖοι of the latter.[59] Ἰουδαῖοι, the Greek name first used by Greek outsiders,[60] was applied to residents of Judaea, the chief territory of this people containing its chief city and Temple, and then eventually to all persons these outsiders thought were related ethnically, politically, economically, socially and culturally to the Judaeans, their holy city and their Temple. Israelite residents of the Diaspora eventually also adopted the appellation when speaking of themselves to outsiders and then eventually when speaking of, or addressing, ingroup members as well. Kuhn saw 1 Maccabees as typical of Palestinian Israelite practice.[61] Here 'Israel' is the regular insider term of self reference. Ἰουδαῖος (39×), on the other hand, appears only in the speech of non-Israelites, in diplomatic correspondence between Judaea and outsiders, by Judaean envoys to Romans, or in official domestic documents and official titles, including those on Hasmonean coins. 2 Maccabees, *3 Maccabees*, and Greek inscriptions, Kuhn notes,[62] display a different usage, one influenced by Greek outsider practice.[63] In this literature, 'Israel' is used only infrequently (mostly in prayer, liturgical and biblical formulas) and Ἰουδαῖος is the main identifier.[64]

56. For the inscriptions see P. Bruneau, 'Les Israélites de Délos et la juiverie délienne', *Bulletin des Correspondances Hellénique* 106 (1982), pp. 465-504.

57. Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ', pp. 359-69; Gutbrod, 'Ἰουδαῖος', pp. 369-75.

58. See, e.g., Sir. 17.17; *Jub.* 33.20; *Ps. Sol*. 14.5; Jdt. 4.1; 5.1; 7.1; also Bar.; *4 Ezra*; *Test. XII Patr*.; *3 En*. See similarly Kuhli, 'Ἰουδαῖος', representing the present consensus.

59. See Sus. 4, 22; Bel 28; 2 Macc. 65×; *3 Macc.* 29×; so also Philo, Josephus, Aristeas, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Clearchus (cf. Josephus, *Apion* 176–82); Hecataeus (cf. Josephus, *Apion* 183–204); inscriptions.

60. Clearchus, Theophrastus and Megasthenes; see Gutbrod, 'Ἰουδαῖος', pp. 369-70.

61. Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ', pp. 360-61.

62. Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ', pp. 364-65.

63. While the difference in usage is important to note, the Hellenization of Palestine in this period mitigates the plausibility of Kuhn's 'Hellenistic: vs. Palestinian' antithesis.

64. 2 Macc. 65×; *3 Macc*. 29×; *4 Macc.* 5.6. In the majority of instances, Ἰουδαῖος and Ἰουδαῖοι designate residents of Judaea; for the wider sense see 2 Macc. 12.40; *3 Macc.* 1.3; 3.3, 27; 4.1 etc. regarding the Judaeans in Alexandria; *4 Macc.* 5.6. For *Ioudaioi* on the lips of outsiders speaking of, or addressing, Israelites, see the letters of Antiochus IV to Ἰουδαῖοι of Judaea (2 Macc. 9.19; 11.27, 31); a letter of the Romans to Ἰουδαῖοι of Judaea (2 Macc. 11.34); and Lysias' letters to Ἰουδαῖοι of Judaea (2 Macc. 11.16 *bis*); see also Antiochus IV's letter to his brother Lysias (outsider to outsider) about Ἰουδαῖοι (2 Macc. 11.22-24); Ptolemy Philopater's letter to Egyptian military commanders ordering a pogrom against the Ἰουδαῖοι of

The rare term Ἰουδαισμός makes its first appearance here as well (2 Macc. 2.21; 8.1; 14.38 *bis*; *4 Macc.* 4.26). Kuhn opines that it was 'an expression of Hellenistic Judaism' with no Palestinian equivalent. We might add that it apparently was coined as a deliberate contrast to Ἑλληνισμός (2 Macc. 4.13; cf. also τὰ Ἑλληνικά, 2 Macc. 6.9; 11.24).[65] Designating the deliberate pursuit of a *Judaean way of life* in strict observance of Torah and loyalty to the Temple, Ἰουδαισμός implied a concerted resistance to Hellenistic assimilation. Ἰουδαισμός designates not a collectivity of Judaeans, however, but a *Judaean way of life*.[66] Ἰουδαία, on the other hand, denotes not only the territory but occasionally its residents.[67] These neologisms notwithstanding, the deity is known as the 'God of Israel' (2 Macc. 9.5; cf. 1QS 3.24), 'Redeemer of Israel' (*3 Macc.* 7.23), not the 'God of Judah/Judaea/Judaeans'. The people are identified as Ἰουδαῖοι but also as 'Israel' (2 Macc. 1.25, 26; 10.38, 11.6; *3 Macc.* 3.16; 6.9), 'House of Israel' (*3 Macc.* 3.10), 'Israelite children' (*4 Macc*. 18.1), 'Hebrews',[68] or 'children of Abraham' (*4 Macc.* 6.16, 22). The land promised to Abraham and progeny is referred to only as *eretz Israel* or *gê Israel*, never *eretz Yehuda*.[69] The God of the people of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob likewise is designated only as 'the God of Israel', never 'the God of Judah/Judaea' or 'God of the Judaeans'. Numismatic evidence is consistent with this nomenclature. A shekel probably minted during the revolt of 66–72 CE bears the inscription 'skekel of Israel'. The coins minted by the residents of Judaea during the Bar Kochba revolt (132–35 CE) likewise bore a legend referring not to 'Judaea' but to 'Israel': 'Year 1 of the liberation of Israel', 'Year 2 of the Freedom of Israel'.[70] The contrast to Roman nomenclature could not be clearer. Vespasian announced his conquest of Judaea with coins referring not to Israel but Judaea and bearing the legend '*Judaea capta*'.

The New Testament

The New Testament writings present a less uniform picture in regard to use of the terms Ἰσραήλ, Ἰσραηλίτης and Ἰουδαῖος as identifiers. On the whole,

---

Egypt (*3 Macc*. 3.12-30; cf. 7.1-9). For insiders addressing fellow insiders as Ἰουδαῖοι see 2 Macc. 1.1 (Ἰουδαῖοι of Jerusalem writing to fellow Ἰουδαῖοι in Egypt); also 1.7, 10. On the other hand see the ingroup address at *4 Macc.* 18.1, 'O Israelite children, descendents of the seed of Abraham…'

65. See also Y. Amir, 'The Term *Ioudaismos*: A Study in Jewish-Hellenistic Self-Identification', *Immanuel* 14 (1982), pp. 34-41.

66. Josephus does not employ Ἰουδαισμός at all; for the verb Ἰουδαίζω see *War* 2.463; cf. 2.454; 2.463; *Ant*. 11.284.

67. See 2 Macc. 5.11; 10.24.

68. See 2 Macc. 7.31; 11.13; 15.37; *4 Macc.* 4.11; 5.2, 4; 8.2; 9.6, 18; 17.9.

69. On *eretz Israel* see Robert L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 20-64.

70. The contrasting legend *hay^{e}hudim* on earlier Hasmonean coins Kuhn sees as exemplifying the use of the term or its equivalent, *Ioudaioi*, in official titles.

however, they manifest a continued preference for 'Israel' as chief self-designation, especially in Israelite insider-to-insider discourse.

The Gospels and Acts

᾽Ιουδαῖος/᾽Ιουδαῖοι

᾽Ιουδαῖος appears in the New Testament a total of 194/195 times,[71] with the Gospel of John (71×) and Acts (79×) containing the largest number of occurrences. In the Synoptic tradition, ᾽Ιουδαῖος appears far less often than *Israêl* as a term for Jesus' compatriots, with most involving statements of outsiders. Of the five occurrences of ᾽Ιουδαῖος in Matthew,[72] all but one[73] are in statements of *outsiders*. Of the six in Mark,[74] all but one[75] are in the Passion narrative and all these likewise occur in statements of *outsiders*. Of the five instances in Luke's Gospel,[76] three are *outsider* statements in the Passion account (Lk. 23.3, 37, 38) and two are statements of the Lukan narrator. One mentions 'elders of the ᾽Ιουδαίων' (Lk. 7.3) and the other (Lk. 23.50) identifies a certain Joseph who sought the body of Jesus from Pilate as 'from Arimithea, a city of the ᾽Ιουδαίων', best translated not as 'Jewish city' (RSV), but 'Judaean city', meaning a city in Judaea. On the whole, insider and outsider terminology is distinguished in direct and indirect discourse, and ᾽Ιουδαῖος appears only on the lips of outsiders. In the few instances where ᾽Ιουδαῖος occurs in comments of the narrators/authors themselves, it has the more inclusive sense consistent with outsider nomenclature. '᾽Ιουδαῖος is never used in the Synoptists [*sic*] as a proper name for the people to whom Jesus comes'.[77]

The Gospel of John and Acts present a more varied picture. In both, ᾽Ιουδαῖοι is used of residents of ᾽Ιουδαία as well as of residents of the Diaspora with connections and loyalties to Judaea, Jerusalem and the Temple.[78] On the one hand,

71. Mt. 5×; Mk 6×; Lk. 5×; Jn 71×; Acts 79×; Rom. 11×; 1 Cor. 8×; 2 Cor. 1×; Gal. 4×; Col. 1×; 1 Thess. 1×; Rev. 2×. For studies on ᾽Ιουδαῖος in the New Testament see Kuhli, '᾽Ιουδαῖος', pp. 193-94.

72. Mt. 2.2; 27.11, 29, 37; 28.15.

73. In Mt. 28.15 the narrator mentions the rumor of Jesus' disciples stealing his corpse (28.11-14) that had been spread *among Judaeans* (παρὰ ᾽Ιουδαίοις) down through his own time. The contrast between the localities of Galilee (28.7-10, 16-20) and Judaea (28.11-15) may favor taking *Judaean* here in the regional rather than the global sense. Otherwise Matthew, with a view to the non-Judaens in his audience, is using ᾽Ιουδαῖοι in the global sense.

74. Mk 7.3; 15.2, 9, 12, 18, 26.

75. Mk 7.3 is a comment of the Markan narrator explaining purity observances of Pharisees and ᾽Ιουδαῖοι from Judaea.

76. Lk. 7.3; 23.3, 37, 38, 50.

77. Gutbrod, '᾽Ιουδαῖος', p. 375.

78. Urban C. von Walde, 'The Johannine "Jews": A Critical Survey', *NTS* 28 (1981–82), pp. 33-60, presents a list and discussion of different scholarly positions regarding Johannine use of *Ioudaioi*.

the term Ἰουδαῖος often occurs in explicit conjunction with Ἰουδαία or Jerusalem,[79] or identifies persons mentioned in scenes occurring in Judaea[80] and so can identify *residents of Judaea*. John 7.1, for instance, clearly illustrates this connection of Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἰουδαία: 'After this, Jesus went about in Galilee; he would not go about in *Ioudaia* because the *Ioudaioi* sought to kill him'.[81] In other cases, the context suggests that Ἰουδαῖοι has a more inclusive sense and identifies persons, who according to birth, ethnicity, cult, Torah observance, and loyalty to Judaea and its Temple are 'Judaean', wherever they reside.[82] Danker (BDAG, p. 478) explains: 'Since Jerusalem sets the standard for fidelity to Israel's tradition, and since Jerusalem is located in Judea, Ἰ.[ουδαῖος] frequently suggests conformity to Israel's ancestral belief and practice'. Some of these Judaeans, according to John, identified with Jesus and his teaching,[83] while others opposed him.[84] In both cases, Ἰουδαῖος is found on the lips of *outsiders* when referring to Israelites.[85] Acts also has Ἰουδαῖος on the lips of Israelite insiders when addressing outsiders.[86] Acts is alone in depicting Paul declaring himself to be a Ἰουδαῖος (22.3) to persons gathered in Jerusalem whom he addresses in Hebrew/Aramaic and calls 'brothers and fathers' (22.1-3). In this singular case, Paul is depicted as calling himself a Ἰουδαῖος when addressing fellow insiders. On the whole, the usage of John and Acts reflects the influence of both insider and outsider conventional practice.

79. See Jn 1.19; 2.18, 20; 2.23–3.1; 3.22-25; 7.1, 11, 13, 15, 35; 11.7-8, 54, 55; 18.14; Acts 2.5, 14; 10.39; 12.3; 21.11; 22.3; 23.11-12; 25.1-2, 7, 9, 15, 24; 26.4, 21; cf. Lk. 23.3-5; Jn 4.9.

80. See, e.g., Jn 2.18, 20; 3.1, 22, 25; 5.10, 15, 16, 18; 7.11, 13, 15, 35; 8.22, 31, 48, 52, 57; 9.18, 22 (2×); 10.19, 24, 31, 33; 11.19, 31, 33, 36, 45, 54; 12.9, 11; 13.33; 18.14, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38; 19.3, 7, 12, 14, 20, 31, 38; 20.19; Acts 2.14; 12.3, 11; 21.20, 21, 39; 22.30; 23.12, 20, 27; 26.2, 3; 28.17-19; cf. Lk. 23.51. Walde ('Johannine "Jews"') would also allow Jn 11.8.

81. Agreeing with M. Lowe ('Who were the *Ioudaioi*?' *NovT* 18.2 [1976], pp. 101-30) and others who consider *Ioudaioi* in John as meaning 'Judaean' in most instances, von Walde ('Johannine "Jews"') argues convincingly that the Johannine character of most of these cases is their reference not to Judaeans *en masse* or to the 'common people' (excepting the redacted passages 6.41, 52) but to the Judaean '*authorities*'.

82. See Jn 2.13; 4.22; 5.1; 6.4, 41, 52; 7.2; 18.35; 19.40, 42; Acts 2.10; 9.22, 23; 10.22; 11.19; 13.5, 6, 43, 45, 50; 14.1, 2, 4, 5, 19; 16.1, 3, 20; 17.1, 5, 10, 13, 17; 18.2 (2×), 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 19, 24, 28; 19.10, 13, 17, 33, 34; 20.3, 19, 21; 21.27; 22.12; 23.27-29; 24.9, 18, 24, 27; 25.8, 10; 28.17, 19; cf. 19.14).

83. See Jn 10.21; 11.45; 12.11; cf. Acts 2.41; 4.4; 21.20.

84. See Jn 2.18, 20; 5.10, 15, 16; 6.41, 52.

85. See Jn 18.39; 19.3, 19, 21; Acts 18.14; 23.27.

86. See Acts 10.28; 21.39; 24.5; 26.2-4, 7, 21.

Ἰσραήλ *and* Ἰσραηλίτης

The term Ἰσραήλ appears sixty-eight times in the New Testament[87] and Ἰσραηλίτης, nine times.[88] The evidence indicates that it was these terms, not 'Judaean' or 'Judaea' or 'Judaism', that were the preferred terms of self-identification for insiders speaking to insiders within the House of Israel. This is true both of the larger ethnic entity in general and for Jesus and his followers in particular.

Members of the ingroup Israel, consistent with Jesus and his followers, are said to refer to the ethnic entity as 'Israel'[89] or 'sons of Israel'[90] or 'people of Israel'.[91] They call one another 'Israelites'.[92] They designated their homeland as the 'land of Israel'[93] and spoke of their God as the 'God of Israel'.[94] They identified Jesus as belonging to Israel.[95] His Israelite revilers mocked him as 'king of Israel'.[96]

Jesus is portrayed as including himself within, and focusing his mission on, what he called 'Israel' or 'the House of Israel',[97] never speaking of 'Judaeans' or 'Judaism'. Mt. 10.6 and 15.24 are particularly instructive concerning the nomenclature of Jesus. In sending out the Twelve he states, 'Go rather to the House of Israel' (Mt. 10.6) and later says of himself 'I was sent only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel' (Mt. 15.24). If authentic, as is likely, these statements indicate Jesus' own usage and his preference for the expression 'House of Israel' as collective identifier of his people. The Gospel of John confirms this usage. The fourth evangelist, despite his frequent use of the term Ἰουδαῖος, has Jesus using customary Israelite self-identifying language when he depicts Jesus saying of Nathanel, 'Behold, an Ἰσραηλίτης in whom there is no guile' (Jn 1.47).

The followers of Jesus likewise are depicted as speaking of 'Israel' when addressing other Israelites. They identified themselves directly or indirectly as

87. See Mt. 12×; Mk 2×; Lk. 12×; compare Jn 4×; Acts 15×; Paul 17×; Heb. 3×; Rev. 3×.

88. See Jn 1.47; Acts 2.22; 3.12; 5.35; 13.16; 21.28; Rom. 9.4; 11.1; 2 Cor. 11.22.

89. See Mt. 2.6; 9.33; Mk 15.32; Lk. 1.54, 68; 2.32, 34; Jn 1.31.

90. See Mt. 27.9; cf. Lk. 1.16 (an angel speaking); Acts 5.21.

91. See Lk. 2.32. 'House of Jacob' (Lk. 1.33; Acts 7.46) was a synonymous ingroup collective term.

92. See Acts 21.28; cf. Rom. 9.4; 11.1-2; 2 Cor. 11.22.

93. See Mt. 2.20, 21; cf. 10.23.

94. See Mt. 15.31; Lk. 1.68; Acts 13.17.

95. See Mk 15.32/Mt. 27.42; Jn 3.10; 12.13; cf. Lk. 24.21; Jn 12.13.

96. See Mk 15.32/Mt. 27.42; contrast the positive coloration of the phrase in Jn 1.50; 12.13.

97. See Mt. 8.10; 9.33; 10.6, 23; 15.24; 19.28; Mk 12.29 (citing Deut. 6.4); Lk. 4.25, 27; 7.9; 22.30; Jn 1.31.

'Israelites'[98] or 'sons of Israel'[99] or as belonging to 'Israel'[100] or to the 'House of Israel'[101] or the 'people of Israel'[102] or the 'Israel of God'.[103] They also addressed their compatriots as 'Israelites', as Peter did in Jerusalem[104] or Paul in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13.16) and Jerusalem (Acts 21.28). They referred to the deity as 'the (Lord) God of Israel' (Mt. 15.31; Lk. 1.68; Acts 13.17) and spoke of Jesus as the 'king of Israel' (Jn 1.50; 12.13). Paul, even when addressing an audience that included Gentile believers, spoke of himself (Rom. 11.1) and his 'brothers and kin by physical descent' as 'Israelites' (Rom. 9.4 and by implication, Rom. 11.1) or 'Israel' (Rom. 9.6, 27) or 'sons of Israel' (Rom. 9.27; 2 Cor. 3.7, 13), while also naming his fellow-believers 'Israelites' (2 Cor. 11.22) and members of the 'Israel of God' (Gal. 6.16). The evangelists, beyond the segments of direct and indirect discourse, also speak of the people as 'Israel' (Lk. 1.80; 2.25; Acts 5.31) or 'sons of Israel' (Mt. 27.9, citing Zech. 11.13; Acts 5.21), the territory as the 'land of Israel' (Mt. 2.21), and their deity as 'the God of Israel' (Mt. 15.31).

Followers of Jesus as Named by Other Israelites

Followers of Jesus, when named by other Israelites, according to Acts, were referred to as 'Galileans'[105] as was Simon Peter in Jerusalem[106] and Jesus himself.[107] At Jerusalem, according to Acts, a spokesman for the Jerusalem Temple authorities, Tertullus, identified the band of Jesus followers as 'the party of the Nazoreans' (αἵρεσις Ναζοραιῶν) and accused Paul of being its ringleader (Acts 24.1-8). This Jesus group, according to Acts, was also called 'the Way', an Israelite designation implying practice of Israelite *Halaka* or 'the way of righteousness'.[108] Paul of Tarsus also used 'Israelite' as a self-designation and this brings us to the next part of our investigation.

98. See 2 Cor. 11.22; cf. Jn 1.47.
99. See Acts 7.23, 37; 9.15; 10.36; Rev. 7.4; 21.12; cf. Acts 9.15 (God speaking).
100. See Lk. 24.21; Acts 1.6; 5.31; 13.23; 28.20.
101. See Acts 2.36 (Peter speaking); Acts 7.42 (Stephan speaking); cf. also Heb. 8.8, 10.
102. See Acts 4.10, 27; 13.17, 24.
103. See Gal. 6.16.
104. Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται (Acts 2.22; 3.12; 5.35). The address may be synonymous with ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι (Acts 2.14; cf. 2.5) but in any case is more inclusive than the regionally specific ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι, who, 2.5 makes clear, are residing in Jerusalem and thus Judaea. Cf. also ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (Acts 2.29; cf. 3.17). All are expressions consistent with the self-identifications used by ingroup Israel.
105. See Acts 2.7; cf. also Acts 1.11 (angel speaking).
106. See Mk 14.70/Lk. 22.59.
107. See Mt. 26.69; cf. Lk. 23.6.
108. See Acts 9.2; 19.9, 23; 22.4; cf. 'the way of righteousness', 2 Pet. 2.2.

Paul

In terms of direct self-identification, Paul provides the most evidence but also a complex picture. In none of the extant letters does he identify himself according to his place of origin, Tarsus, in contrast to Luke's description of Paul in Acts.[109] Instead he refers to his lineage, tribe, ancestors and *ethnos*. In regard to his terminology of identification and self-identification in general, Paul employs both sets of terms, Ἰσραήλ and Ἰσραηλίτης as well as Ἰουδαῖος and paronyms, and it seems to be the audiences addressed that are determinative.

He employs the ingroup term Ἰσραήλ sixteen times in his letters to designate the people of God to which he himself and Jesus also belong.[110] He uses Ἰσραηλίτης three times to identify himself and other Israelites as co-members of the House of Israel (Rom. 9.4; 11.1; 2 Cor. 11.22). This is consistent with Luke's account of Paul addressing fellow insiders as 'Israelites' (Acts 13.16; 21.28). In 1 Cor. 10.18 he designates the Israel of the Exodus generation as 'Israel according to the flesh' (Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα), that is, Israel as determined by blood, kinship, and descent from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—implying a contrast to an Israel according to the Spirit comprising the followers of Jesus the Christ. In his letter to the Romans he makes this implied contrast explicit. Here he discusses the issue of relations within Israel between those embracing a righteousness based on faith and those insisting on a righteousness based on observance of the Law (Rom. 9–11). Making the startling claim that 'not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel' (9.6), he posits two different groups laying claim to the name and the reality of Israel: the false versus the true 'children of Abraham', 'children of the flesh' and 'children of the promise' (Rom. 9.7-9); the former as those seeking righteousness through observance of Torah and the latter as those trusting in a righteousness conferred by God in Jesus Christ (Rom. 9.30–10.15). In Galatians he identifies the latter as constituting 'the Israel of God' (Gal. 6.16).

As to Ἰουδαία, Ἰουδαῖος and paronyms, Paul mentions Ἰουδαία four times[111] and employs the term Ἰουδαῖος twenty-three times.[112] The collocation of Ἰουδαία and Ἰουδαῖοι in 1 Thess. 2.14 shows most clearly how the association of *place* ('Judaea') and *group name* ('Judaeans') was as familiar to Paul as it was to his contemporaries. Galatians (8×) and Romans (11×) contain the majority of occurrences of Ἰουδαῖος in Paul. These are writings addressed to ethnically

109. See Acts 9.11; 21.39; 22.3; cf. 9.30; 11.25.

110. Rom. 9.6 *bis*, 27 *bis* ('sons of Israel', quoting Isa. 10.22), 31; 10.19, 21; 11.2, 7, 25, 26; 1 Cor. 10.18; 2 Cor. 3.7, 13 ('sons of Israel'); Gal. 6.16; Phil. 3.5. 'Israêl' also appears once in Ephesians (2.12). Beyond the Gospels and Paul, the term *Israel* appears in the expressions 'house of Israel' (Heb. 8.8, 10) and 'sons of Israel', referring to ancient Israel (Heb. 11.22; Rev. 2.14) or to redeemed followers of Jesus Christ (Rev. 7.4; 21.12).

111. Rom. 15.31; 2 Cor. 1.16; Gal. 1.22; 1 Thess. 2.14.

112. Rom. 1.16; 2.9, 10, 17, 28, 29; 3.1, 9, 29; 9.24; 10.12; 1 Cor. 1.22, 23, 24; 9.20; 10.32; 12.13; 2 Cor. 11.24; Gal. 2.13-15; 3.28; 1 Thess. 2.14; cf. Col. 3.12.

mixed communities of the Diaspora and deal with issues of insider–outsider relations and the transformation of traditional distinctions within the messianic communities. When Paul distinguishes Ἰουδαῖοι from Ἕλληνες and other outgroups,[113] Ἰουδαῖοι encompasses all members of the ἔθνος wherever they reside. These ethnic contrasts comprise the majority of instances of Ἰουδαῖος in Paul (sixteen of twenty-three total occurrences) and likely reflect his reliance on standard Diaspora 'we–they' distinctions and formulations.

Four further terms related to Ἰουδαῖος and Ἰουδαία appear only in Paul in the New Testament and only in Galatians. These are a single occurrence of the adverb Ἰουδαϊκῶς ('in a Judaean manner', Gal. 2.14),[114] a single occurrence of the verb Ἰουδαΐζω ('live in a Judaean manner', Gal. 2.14), and two occurrences of Ἰουδαϊσμός ('a living according to Judaean belief and practice', Gal. 1.13, 14). These four latter terms are just as rare outside the New Testament and in no way constituted customary terms of self-identification.[115] As already indicated, they were coined in the second century BCE, probably by Greek-speaking Ἰουδαῖοι, in Israel's struggle to resist intense Hellenistic political pressure to assimilate to an alien Greek way of life. The 'Judaean' manner of living, to which all three terms refer, involved, at minimum, observance of Torah, dietary rules, and circumcision, practices that distinguished and demarcated Ἰουδαῖοι from the Hellenized macrosociety.[116] Taking the term Ἰουδαϊσμός that once contrasted to and opposed Ἑλληνισμός,[117] Paul gave it and its related words a new twist. In the apostle's rhetoric, they no longer connoted the defensive stance of a persecuted minority but rather an offensive undertaking with negative rather than positive overtones. Rather than indicating a way of life resistant to macrosocial assimilation, they depict in Paul's argument a Judaean way of life forcefully, needlessly and hypocritically imposed upon others.[118]

The rarity of these terms must be fully appreciated, given the ubiquity with which the term 'Judaism' currently is employed by historians and exegetes. It is

113. For Ἰουδαῖος vs. Ἕλλην see Rom. 1.16; 2.9, 10; 3.9, 29; 9.24; 10.12; 1 Cor. 1.22-24; 9.20-21; 10.32; 12.13; Gal. 3.28; cf. Col. 3.11. For Ἰουδαῖοι vs. ἔθνη see Rom. 3.28; 9.24; Gal. 2.14; see also Ἰουδαικῶς-ἐθνικῶς. Beyond Paul, the Ἰουδαῖοι vs. ἔθνη distinction appears also in Acts 14.5; 18.4; 19.10, 17; 20.21. Ἰουδαῖοι are distinguished from Ἕλλήναι in Acts 14.1. John 4.9 has the distinction of Ἰουδαῖοι vs. Σαμαρίται on the lips of a Samaritan woman.

114. Compare the adjective Ἰουδαικός ['Judaean'] appearing only in Tit. 1.14.

115. In the Septuagint, Ἰουδαΐζω appears only once (Est. 8.17) and Ἰουδαισμός only five times and in only 2 and 4 Maccabees (2 Macc. 2.21; 8.1; 14.38 *bis*; *4 Macc.* 4.26). Ἰουδαισμός also appears in a synagogue inscription at Stobi where it denotes not a *collectivity* of persons but a particular mode of living, 'the Judaean way of belief and life', BDAG, p. 479.

116. See 2 Macc. 4.7-17; 6.1-11, 18; 7.1-41; 7.42–8.1; 11.24; *4 Macc.* 4.19-26; 5.1–6.30; Josephus, *War* 2.454.

117. See also the synonyms Ἑλληνικὸς χαρακτήρ, 2 Macc. 4.10; Ἑλληνικὸς βίος, *4 Macc.* 8.8; τὰ Ἑλληνικά, 2 Macc. 6.9; 11.24.

118. See Gal. 2.11-21; 4.9-10; 5.1-12; 6.12-15.

ironic and unfortunate that a name occurring so infrequently in the literature of Israel and the New Testament should have become in modern times the most frequent designation of the children of Israel. How profound the lexical and ideological shadow of Paul! Even the singular ὁ Ἰουδαισμός is misleading, for it suggests a consensus regarding matters of belief and practice and a social consolidation that did not exist in these early centuries. Thus it has become standard practice to follow Jacob Neusner and speak of 'Judaisms' in the plural.[119] But a better move would be to abandon this rarely used and misleading term altogether. Subsuming the variety of groups of followers of Jesus Christ in the New Testament period under the singular term 'Christianity' is similarly misleading as well as anachronistic. The present use of this singular term in reference to the New Testament era not only obscures or denies the plurality and diversity of the several groups of Jesus followers in this early period. This usage is also anachronistic, since the term itself did not even exist.

When identifying himself, Paul occasionally included himself among the Ἰουδαῖοι (Gal. 2.15; Rom. 9.24; 1 Cor. 9.20). More frequently he spoke of himself as a 'Hebrew' or an 'Israelite', a member of 'Israel'—traditionally-cherished insider terms. Three such instances are striking in their similarity of nomenclature. According to Gal. 2.14 Paul directed the following words to Cephas: 'If you, though a Ἰουδαῖος, live in a Gentile fashion (ἐθνικῶς) and not in a Judaean fashion (ἰουδαικῶς), how can you compel the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη) to live in a Judaean fashion (ἰουδαικως)'. The language is a rare instance of Paul, an Israelite addressing another Israelite, Cephas/Peter, as a Ἰουδαῖος. In the following verse, Paul includes himself among those he names Ἰουδαῖοι: 'We ourselves, who are Ἰουδαῖοι by birth and not Gentile sinners…' Two points may help explain why Paul identifies both Cephas and himself as Ἰουδαῖοι rather than as 'Israelites'. First, Paul is directing the letter containing these words to a mixed audience of persons of Israelite and non-Israelite origins. The terms in which he recounted the Antioch incident and its implications are those that he judged would be most familiar to an audience composed primarily of former Gentile outsiders. The actual language he employed in addressing Cephas in the face-to-face encounter may have been different, involving not Ἰουδαῖος but Ἰσραηλίτης. Second, his use of the conventional contrast of Ἰουδαῖος vs. ἔθνος, ἰουδαικῶς vs. ἐθνικῶς for opposed ways of life required categorizing Cephas and himself as Ἰουδαῖοι (since they certainly were not among τὰ ἔθνη). Rhetoric, audience, use of a conventional global contrast, and linguistic consistency thus could explain the unusual use of Ἰουδαῖος here.[120] In Rom. 9.24 Paul includes himself among

119. Jacob Neusner, 'Varieties of Judaism in the Formative Age', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Formative Judaism* (BJS, 41; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 59-89; idem, *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

120. And implied as well in Rom 3.9.

those whom God called 'not only from the Judaeans but also from the Gentiles'. His point is not his identification as a Judaean but that Judeaeans and Gentiles, among whom he is included, have been called by God into a new communal reality transcending traditional ethnic boundaries. A similar sense of the inclusiveness of the 'new creation', and of his gospel, underlies Paul's description of his mission strategy in 1 Cor. 9.19-23. His 'becoming as a Judaean to win Judaeans' (9.20), becoming 'as one under the law' to those under the law, and his 'becoming as one outside the law' to those outside the law, along with his 'becoming weak' to those who are weak, all had the same aim—to gain these several groups for the body of Christ. In these cases where Paul identifies himself as a 'Judaean' or includes himself among Judaeans, he is employing traditional 'we–they' language and antitheses to proclaim an overcoming of traditional distinctions and discriminations in the new inclusive messianic community.

Three other passages (2 Cor. 11.22-23; Phil. 3.5-6; Rom. 9.3-4) illustrate the self-identifying terminology Paul uses to persuade Israelite insiders. While all three letters in which these passages are contained have mixed audiences composed of former Israelites and Gentiles, the passages themselves involve Paul the insider addressing fellow Israelite insiders.

Comparing himself in his second letter to the Corinthians to opponents he calls 'false apostles' (11.13) who were challenging his apostolic legitimacy, he poses three questions containing three cardinal markers of Israelite ingroup identity (2 Cor. 11.22-23):

> Are they Hebrews? So am I.
> Are they Israelites? So am I.
> Are they descendents of Abraham? So am I.

His letter to the Philippians contains a similar set of self-identifiers (3.5-6). Warning against those he calls 'evil-workers who mutilate the flesh' (3.2), and claiming that he himself places no confidence in the flesh though he had reason to because of his ingroup credentials, he then cites those credentials:

> (I was) circumcised on the eighth day,
> (I am) of the people of Israel,
> of the tribe of Benjamin,
> a Hebrew born of Hebrews[121]
> as to the law, a Pharisee

121. Harvey, *The True Israel*, pp. 104-147, is likely correct in concluding that 'Hebrew' in Paul's day identified someone whose family had or claimed to have connections going back to the patriarchs and who was rooted in, and faithful to, the venerable traditions of the past. 'Hebrew' could also designate an Israelite who knew and normally spoke Hebrew and/or Aramaic as distinguished from a Ἑλληνιστής, an Israelite whose conventional language was Greek; cf. Acts 6.1. According to Acts (21.40; 22.2; 26.14), Paul was fluent in Hebrew as well as Greek. For 'Hebrew' as ingroup identifier see also 2 Macc. 7.31; 11.13; 15.37; *4 Macc.* 4.11; 5.2; 8.2; 9.6, 18; 12.7; 16.15; 17.9; the synagogue inscription from Corinth, συναγωγὴ

as to zeal, a persecutor of the church,
as to righteousness under the law, blameless. (Phil. 3.5-6)

In his letter to the Romans, Paul extends this familiar set of self-identifiers. Addressing the thorny issues of the relation of Christ followers (including those of Israelite and non-Israelite origin) to flesh-and-blood Israelites outside the Christ movement and the final fate of Israel, he affirms that salvation is assured for his kin (Israelites outside the Christ movement), since God is faithful to his promises (chs. 9–11). His identifying himself with Israel is an important part of this affirmation and aims at persuading Israelite Christ followers to share his perspective and follow his lead. In this context he speaks as a fellow Israelite to a mixed audience of Christ followers of both Israelite and Gentile origins and identifies his 'kinsmen by stock' as 'Israelites', implying the same of himself (Rom. 9.3-4). In chapter 11, he makes his own identity as an Israelite explicit: 'I myself am an Ἰσραηλίτης, a descendent of Abraham, a member of the tribe of Benjamin' (Rom. 11.1), repeating almost verbatim the self-designations of 2 Cor. 11.22 and Phil. 3.5. The repetition of the same markers of identity—Israelite, Hebrew, tribe of Benjamin, descendant of Abraham—indicates the weight that they held for Paul and fellow Israelites. The term Ἰουδαῖος is not among them. The terms he does use are those that are more familiar, honored, and rhetorically persuasive to Israelite insiders than to Gentile outsiders. Paul presumes that those of Israelite origin would be impressed and emotionally moved by these traditional terms of self-identification and thereby convinced of the strong bonds uniting them. Many in his audience are former Gentiles. With them also he affirms his solidarity as 'apostle to the Gentiles' (11.13-32), stressing repeatedly their inclusion in the new community in Christ (9.24-33; 11.11-12, 17-24, 25; cf. 3.30; 4.9-25). As far as his fellow Israelites are concerned, Paul chooses terms that will have the most positive persuasive effect on them as well.[122] Altogether these passages indicate that Paul, when identifying himself, especially to those of Israelite origin, preferred to speak of himself not as a Ἰουδαῖος but as a 'Hebrew', a 'descendent of Abraham', an 'Israelite' and member of 'the people of Israel'.

The cluster of rare Ἰουδαῖος-related terms in Galatians is explainable on the basis of issue and situation. The situation was Paul's offer of the gospel to so-called 'Gentiles' in Galatia and his admission of these outsider Gentiles to the household of faith, the 'Israel of God' (Gal. 6.16). The issue under contention was requirement or non-requirement of circumcision, Law observance and calendar

---

῾Εβραίων; *Or. Sib*. 5.155-61, 256-59. See also Kuhn, 'Ἰσραήλ', pp. 367-69; Gutbrod, 'Ἰουδαῖος', pp. 372-75, 389-91.

122. 'By so doing', Esler, *Romans*, p. 363, aptly observes, 'he created a link with all the Israelites in his audience, who were more likely to accept what he had to say about Israel if he could establish his credentials for speaking at all.'

as conditions of membership. Paul contested the requirement that outsider Gentiles should be compelled to Ἰουδαΐζειν, that is, 'to live as Torah-observant Ἰουδαῖοι' now that Jesus Christ had demonstrated how children of Abraham can live by faith. The predominantly Gentile audience invited use of the identifier Ἰουδαῖοι rather than Ἰσραηλῖται, and the issue under contention invited talk about Ἰουδαΐζειν, Ἰουδαικῶς and Ἰουδαισμός, terms otherwise alien to Paul's vocabulary and that of all other New Testament authors.[123] It is tragic irony that a rarity of Pauline and New Testament usage has had such undue influence on later nomenclature and has been allowed to obscure Paul's actual lexical preferences.

The Resulting Picture

This survey of evidence makes several things clear.

1. Jesus identified himself and his associates as Israelites, and his mission as directed to the House of Israel. He was identified by other Israelite insiders according to his Israelite family and lineage and by his place of birth and upbringing, Nazareth and Galilee. He was Yeshua bar Yoseph, an 'Israelite', a 'Galilean', a 'Nazarene' from Nazareth of Galilee, but not a 'Judaean' resident in Judaea.

2. Jesus never called himself a Ἰουδαῖος and was never designated as such by fellow Israelites. He was called, or thought of as, a Ἰουδαῖος only by non-Israelite outsiders whose terminology was consistent with Hellenistic and Roman practice, designating as 'Judaean' all residents of Judaea, together with all those connected to Judaea by blood relations, Torah allegiance, patriotism, and loyalty to Judaea, the holy city of Jerusalem and the Temple.

3. His first followers were identified by fellow Israelites also as 'Galileans', 'Nazarenes', or members of 'the Way' but never as 'Judaeans'.

4. They too, like Jesus, viewed themselves as Israelites. They preferred 'Israel' and 'Israelite' as self-identifiers when speaking to the ingroup Israel and when addressing fellow disciples.

5. Paul's usage is consistent with this pattern. He too prefers 'Israel' and 'Israelite' as self-identifiers in settings where Israelite Christ followers or

123. Dunn, 'Who Did Paul Think He Was?', pp. 192-93, among others, arrives at similar conclusions: 'Israelite' is Paul's preferred term, identifying a historic relation to God and 'best expressing Paul's new perception of his own identity and the identity he wanted to promote among his converts' (p. 193). Elsewhere he also notes regarding the New Testament as a whole (Dunn, 'Judaism in the Land of Israel in the First Century', in J. Neusner [ed.], *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. II. *Historical Syntheses* [Leiden: Brill, 1995], p. 235), that ' "Jew" [*sic*, referring to *Ioudaios*] betokens the perspective of the spectator (Jewish included), "Israel" that of the participant'.

Israelites outside the Christ movement are present. With an eye to the Israelite fellow believers who are in the audiences of his letters to the Philippians, the Corinthians and the Romans, he identifies himself as an 'Israelite'. With an eye to his Gentile readers, on the other hand, he can also identify himself, as a concession to their nomenclature, as a Ἰουδαῖος.

Jesus was Not a 'Christian'

As Jesus was not a '*Ioudaios*' but an 'Israelite', so he was also not a 'Christian' and was never called a Christian. This is the case for two simple reasons. In Jesus' lifetime, the term Χριστιανός did not yet exist. Secondly, if it had existed, its meaning—'partisan of Christ', 'Christ lackey'—would have prevented it from being used of Jesus who was rather thought to be the Christ himself. Nor were the followers of Jesus during his lifetime classified as Χριστιανοί 'Christians' since the nomenclature had not yet been created. Χριστιανός appears only three times in the New Testament, in only two writings from the later third of the first century (Acts 11.26; 26.28; 1 Pet. 4.16). A Greek term with a borrowed Latin ending (-ιανος/-*ianus*), it originated within Latin-speaking or Latin-influenced circles where 'Christ' was regarded as a proper name and the suffix -*ianus* designated a partisan, adherent or client of the one named, in analogy to formulations such as *Herodianoi* (Mk 3.6; 12.13; Mt. 22.16), *Kaisarianoi*, *Oualentinianoi* and the like. It originated not as a term of self-identification but as an opprobrious label coined by outsiders to mock and demean the followers of the crucified Jesus Christ as 'Christ lackeys'. It was only slowly accepted by Christ-followers as a self-designation. The most recent discussion of the term is contained in my Anchor Bible commentary on 1 Peter.[124]

Use of the terms 'Christian' and 'Christianity' today to identify Jesus and his earliest followers is anachronistic and problematic for reasons similar to those concerning 'Jew' and 'Judaism'. The words as employed today imply elements of belief and behavior that became essential features of Christianity only in the elaboration of christological and trinitarian doctrine and ecclesial practice after the New Testament period. Calling Jesus and his earliest followers 'Christians'

124. John H. Elliott, *1 Peter: A New Translation and Commentary* (AB, 37B; New York: Doubleday, 2000); esp. pp. 784-95. For other studies on the origin, meaning and early use of the term Christian see the works listed in John H. Elliott, *A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Exegesis of I Peter, Its Situation and Strategy* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), p. 791 n. 611; see also BDAG, p. 1091. On its use as designation of a messianic sect within Israel see ibid., pp. 79, 95-96, and Elliott; 'The Jewish Messianic Movement: From Faction to Sect', in Philip F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 75-95.

or members of 'Christianity',[125] or imagining Paul's experiencing of God's revelation and call as a 'conversion' to Christianity, erroneously presuppose an already existent 'religion' and social entity independent of Israel to which Jesus and his earliest followers belonged and to which Paul 'converted'. This is a presupposition that every serious student of the New Testament and this historical period knows is baseless. Inappropriate application of these terms to Jesus and company, however, continues unabated, and the historical distortion remains a glaring problem. It is time finally for interpreters, Bible translators, and commentators to cease and desist. Jesus and the Jesus movement (with all its various movement groups) have their roots in Israel, not 'Judaism'. They were, in the nascent period, predominantly 'Israelites', not 'Jews'; Galileans, not Judaeans; Nazoreans, not 'Christians'. They belonged to the House of Israel, not 'Christianity'.

That Jesus and his first followers were not 'Christians' and never identified themselves as such is so obvious that no comment would seem necessary—except for two troubling facts: popular imagination and academic immobility. As we professors are made well aware by our students and fellow-churchgoers, a common notion of many contemporary Christians—and shared ironically by many Jews for that matter—is that Christianity was up and running as a new religion from the moment Jesus' infant feet hit the turf and his mother worshiped the ground he stood on. The *tertium genus* of which Tertullian eventually spoke was already in motion—so goes the common belief—from the first breath of baby Jesus. Academics, on the other hand, who know better than to call Jesus and his early followers 'Christians', do so anyway, perhaps for convenience, perhaps out of laziness, perhaps out of uncertainty as to what else to call them. But this popular notion and this academic practice have had disastrous consequences. And it is high time for us academics to change our jargon and set straight the historical record.

Summary and Conclusions

Incontrovertible evidence shows that 'Israel' and 'Israelite' were the self-designations preferred by compatriots of Jesus in the first century when addressing other ingroup members. Jesus and his followers shared this preference. They

125. There is no Greek word for 'Christianity' in the New Testament. The term Χριστιανισμός (lit. 'Christianism'), perhaps the linguistically closest such collective expression, first appears in second-century letters of Ignatius (c. 107 CE); see Ignatius, *Magn.* 10.1, 3; *Rom.* 3.3; *Phld* 6.1. It was likely formed on analogy to Ἰουδαισμός as suggested by the contrasts of Ἰουδαισμός and Χριστιανισμός in *Magn.* 10.3 and *Phld* 6.1, and was perhaps coined by Ignatius himself.

saw themselves as Israelites, children of Israel, and referred to themselves and other ingroup persons as such. In the Diaspora, Israelites were called Ἰουδαῖοι by outsiders based on the outsiders' associating them with the land of Ἰουδαία, Jerusalem and the Temple. Diaspora Israelites eventually accommodated to the nomenclature of the dominant culture in accepting and employing the name Ἰουδαῖος as self-designation when addressing outsiders and occasionally also fellow insiders. Often, however, even in the Diaspora, as Paul demonstrates, preference for 'Israel' and 'Israelite' remained strong. The ingroup Israel, on its part, lumped together all non-Israelites as *goiim*, *ethnê* or *Hellênes.*

As a self-designation, 'Israel' had the advantages of antiquity and inclusiveness over the term Ἰουδαῖος. 'Israel' was inscribed in Torah, with a use rooted in the patriarchal history and the story of the house of Jacob/Israel becoming the people of God. Like the term 'Hebrews', it connoted the weight, grandeur and superiority of antiquity. Not so Ἰουδαῖος, which originated far later with Greek-speaking outsiders who applied it indiscriminately to persons who they assumed were related by a common connection with, and loyalty to, the land of Ἰουδαία, Jerusalem and Temple, and the cult and law as practiced there. Its complete absence in the Mishnah, composed by insiders for insiders and embodying insider tradition, and its preference for 'Israel' are most telling. 'Israel', moreover, was a collective term identifying an entire community—no small quality for such a group-oriented and group-defined people as the worshipers of YHWH. By contrast, Ἰουδαῖος applied only to individuals and lacked a collective counterpart.

Ἰουδαῖος in the Second Temple and New Testament period should be translated 'Judaean', not 'Jew'. Translation of Ἰουδαῖος as 'Jew' and the use of 'Judaism' today for Israel of the Second Temple period are problematic for the reasons already stated. They contribute, each in its own way, to the perpetuation of erroneous concepts concerning the historical, political, economic and social-cultural matrix of the ethnic entity Israel in the first century CE. The term 'Jew' as translation of Ἰουδαῖος does not communicate the connection of the name of the people with the name of the land. For the ancient Mediterraneans, the connection of people and land, however, was self-evident and was accompanied by the belief that geographical origin and location determined peoples' characteristics and character.[126] Accordingly, knowing persons to be Judaeans was assumed to assure familiarity with essential features of their nature and character. 'Jew', moreover, is an anachronistic and misleading translation of Ἰουδαῖος, as the latter term was used in the Second Temple period. 'Jew' and 'Jewish' are so defined by features of Israel of the fourth and later centuries that their application to worshipers of YHWH in the first century is historically skewed and

126. For sources and discussion see Malina and Neyrey, *Portraits of Paul*, pp. 113-25; Esler, *Romans*, p. 63.

theologically inaccurate. As Jacob Neusner and others have recommended, 'Jew' and 'Jewish' should therefore be reserved for persons and conditions subsequent to the Mishnah and the Mishnaic period. Philip Esler in fact insists that the translation of Ἰουδαῖος with 'Jew' is 'morally questionable' inasmuch as the word 'Jew' imposes on the Judaeans of Jesus' day 'associations derived from the troubled, indeed, often terrible history of the Jews' of later centuries.[127] Between the Jews of the post-Constantinian age and the Judaeans of Jesus' day there is a vast temporal, political and cultural gulf and much troubled water under the bridge. The conflicts between Christians and Jews of later time must not be read into the accounts of relations between Judaeans and the Jesus movement. Distinguishing Judaeans from Jews can aid in preventing such a misreading.

'Judaism' is a term that is equally misleading. It is a transliteration of Ἰουδαισμός, a rarely used Greek term having no Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent. Ἰουδαισμός appears most infrequently in the Israelite writings, in contrast to its popularity today, and was in no way a conventional term of Israelite parlance. It was employed first in the Maccabean period to designate not a social collectivity but a *Judaean way of behavior*. Accordingly, using 'Judaism' today as a *collective* term for Judaeans around the turn of the eras is linguistically inaccurate since it identified not a community but a type of conduct. Socially it gives the false impression of a social consolidation, ideational consensus, and common practice that did not exist among the diverse parties of Second Temple Israel.[128] Over a decade ago Helmut Koester[129] rightly urged eliminating the term 'Judaism' from discussions of the historical Jesus. It is high time that we finally acted on this wise proposal.

The Jesus of history was neither a Jew nor a Christian but rather an Israelite and a Galilean as were his earliest followers. As Koester on another occasion also bluntly asserted, 'It is a simple historical fact that Jesus was an Israelite from Galilee'.[130] He was in no sense a 'Christian' because in his lifetime neither the term nor the concept even existed. Nor was he a Ἰουδαῖος, even though mistakenly named that by outsiders on rare occasions. He was, more specifically, a Galilean, a Nazarene from Nazareth of Galilee, with all the connotations and

127. Esler, *Romans*, p. 68.

128. Judith Lieu ('Where Did Jews and Christians Meet [or Part Ways]?', in Santiago Guijarro Oporto [ed.], *Los comienzos del cristianismo. IV Simposio del Grupo Europeo de Investigación sobre los Orígenes del Cristianismo* [Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 2006], pp. 217-32) agrees and aptly underlines 'the danger of moving from speaking of 'Jews and Christians' to theorizing 'Judaism and Christianity': the language of -isms implies a degree of coherence and closure that is misleading, and the rarity of both terms in the sources should confirm us in our avoidance of them' (p. 232).

129. Koester, 'The Historical Jesus'.

130. H. Koester, 'Historic Mistakes Haunt the Relationship of Christianity and Judaism', *Biblical Archaeological Review* 21.2 (1995), pp. 26-27 (26).

stereotypes that this identity brought with it. This is how his own people, his Israelite ingroup, identified him, also viewing him more broadly as a member of the people of Israel, the House of Israel, not of 'Judaism', and his following as the 'party of the Nazoreans/Nazarenes'.

Conceiving of Jesus as a 'Jew' in the modern era and especially since the Second World War and the Holocaust, has had the merit of locating him, his family, his initial followers, and his world of vision and memory properly within the House of Israel, rather than imagining them, as did German National Socialist exegetes and anti-Semites, as some kind of 'Aryans' or non-Semites.[131] Speaking of Jesus as a Jew has countered the senseless notion that Jesus had no roots in Israel and is understandable in isolation from Israel, and that the movement associated with him, commonly called 'Christianity', was some version of a new religion or cult in first-century Palestine. It has required people, both Jews and non-Jews alike, to think of him in specifically Jewish terms; it has obligated present Jews to deal with him as 'one of us' and it has obligated present Christians to grapple with their roots in the history of the people they now know as Jews. The thorough-going Jewishness of Jesus is a fundamental starting point for genuine dialogue between present-day Jews and Christians. Nevertheless, 'Jew' is still a misleading identifier of Jesus and 'Israelite' should be preferred. Calling Jesus a 'Jew' obscures the fact that he was a *Galilean* rather than a Judaean, specifically a Galilean Israelite rather than a Judaean Israelite. It has hindered appreciation and further analysis of the economic, political and sociocultural differences between Galileans and Judaeans in Palestine of the first century. Consequently it has contributed toward misinterpretation of several features of the Gospel stories, including the significance of the Galilee-Judaea contrasts. It denies, or at least obscures, the fact that he and his followers were regarded in their own day by their own people as Galileans and not as a party of 'Jews' or 'Judaeans'. Like the term 'Christian', it is also an anachronistic identifier that blurs the reality of Jesus as a representative of first-century rather than fourth-century Israel, even though there are numerous aspects of continuity between the Israel of the Mishnaic and post-Mishnaic periods and the Second Temple period of Jesus' day. After having taught a course at University of San Francisco for over twenty years on 'Jesus the Jew' with my colleague Rabbi David Davis in which we stressed the thorough-going 'Jewishness' of Jesus, I would now rename that course 'Jesus the Israelite' and gladly sacrifice alliteration for historical accuracy.

The Jesus movement was not a Judaean or 'Jewish' phenomenon but originated as a renewal movement within Israel. Emerging around Jesus as yet another faction within first-century Israel, it eventually morphed into an Israelite sect,

131. For a recent analysis of this depressing example of 'nationalistic exegesis' see the critique of Moxnes, 'The Construction of Galilee'.

which over generations slowly separated from other Israelite parties, factions and sects socially as well as ideologically. That process, however, was an intramural affair involving sectarian struggle within Israel.[132] Jesus did not found a new 'religion' and Paul did not 'convert' to it. They were and remained life-long Israelites. Continuing to speak of the earliest Jesus groups as 'Christian' and of Paul's experience as a 'conversion' results in a distortion of historical reality, a misconstrual of the social scene, and a confusion, as well, in contemporary interreligious dialogue. The current conversation between Synagogue and Church bogs down in a morass of false assumptions regarding pedigrees and polemics.

Looming in the background of this discussion is the odious issue of anti-Semitism and whether this condemnatory label is applicable to New Testament authors and writings. The issue is far too complex for discussion here. I do fully agree with Danker, Dunn, Esler and Malina, who, among others, reject the notion. Danker rightly chides scholars for being culturally inattentive to what he has called 'intramuaral Israelite agonistics'. Unless one is prepared to call the House of Hillel 'anti-Semitic' or 'anti-Judaic' when it disputed the Torah interpretations of the House of Shammai, or to call the rabbis 'anti-Semites' for labeling the Sadducees 'Epicureans', it makes no sense to call Israelites such as Jesus or Paul 'anti-Semitic' or 'anti-Judaic' when they disputed and differed from the Torah interpretations and halachic rulings of Pharisees, Sadduceans or other Israelite groups. This, of course, presumes that the social phenomenon under discussion is an ingroup debate of 'sibling rivals' and not a battle between two socially and ideologically independent entities.[133] Malina makes similar points[134] and observes that 'since the dialogue between personages represented in the documents [of the New Testament] and the authors of the documents themselves take place among members of the house of Israel, within Israelite society, or with positive reference to Israelite society, it would be simply silly to designate such interaction as anti-Semitic'.[135] The anachronism as well as unreasonableness of this designation as stressed by Malina and also Pilch[136] is further underlined by Esler: 'Given the inherent connection', he notes, 'between racism, a concept that arose in the nineteenth century [as part of an attempt to claim that Jews were racially inferior] and anti-Semitism, which is really just an example of racism, it is grossly anachronistic to use the expression "anti-Semitic" or

132. See Elliott, 'From Faction to Sect'.

133. That in subsequent centuries Christians developed amnesia concerning the teachings of Shammai and Hillel and that Jews remembered both these sages but not the teaching of Jesus does not alter this historical point.

134. Bruce J. Malina, 'Three Theses for a More Adequate Reading of the New Testament', in Michael G. Lawler and Gail S. Risch (eds.), *Practical Theology: Perspectives from the Plains* (Omaha: Creighton University Press, 2000), pp. 33-60 (44-51).

135. Malina, 'Three Theses', p. 46.

136. John J. Pilch, 'Are There Jews and Christians' and 'Jews and Christians'.

"anti-Semitism" in relation to any phenomena whatever in the ancient Mediterranean world'.[137] The ethnic battles were ongoing in the ancient world but were waged in ethnocentric and never racial terms. Use of the concept 'anti-Semitism' in reference to the New Testament and the first century, Esler rightly stresses, 'serves to perpetuate anti-Jewish prejudices in our society by encouraging the untenable view that the identity of twentieth- and twenty-first century Jews is the same as that of first-century Judaeans and that the former may therefore be held liable for the alleged sins of the latter'.[138]

What names, then, would be accurate and appropriate for us—for exegetes, translators, students, pastors, and those interested in the Bible—to use when referring to Jesus, his followers, and his people? An initial and essential step in any age toward avoiding mislabeling and misconstruing the identity of persons and groups and inadvertently employing ethnic slurs is to call persons and groups by the names they prefer to call themselves. Adopting this as a principle, I make the following set of proposals concerning the terminology we employ for identifying Jesus, his followers and compatriots.

1. Following the lead of ancient Israelite insiders using with fellow insiders their preferred nomenclature of self-identification, let us refer to the ethnic entity as 'Israel', 'House of Israel', and to its members as 'Israelites', 'children of Israel'. This would emulate the insider usage of the Bible, much para-biblical literature, and the Mishnah. Where Israelites are identified by outsiders as Ἰουδαῖοι or where they so identify themselves, let us render Ἰουδαῖος with 'Judaean',[139] understanding thereby that both Ἰουδαῖος and 'Judaean' can have either narrower regional or wider ethnic connotations.

2. Let us refer to Jesus and his earliest followers as 'Israelites' or members of the 'House of Israel'. Or, for more specific identification, let us use the place identifiers 'of Narareth', 'Nazarene', 'of Galilee' for Jesus, and 'Nazarenes', 'Galileans' for his first followers. We can also identify him by parentage: 'Jesus, son of Joseph/son of Mary', and his disciples in like manner ('Peter, son of John/Jonah'). Let us avoid altogether the names 'Jew' and 'Judaean' for identifying Jesus and his earliest followers since they are terms never used as self-identifiers and have either anachronistic ('Jew') or geographically erroneous ('Judaean') implications. Let us stress their roots in Israel, not in 'Judaism'.

3. Let us eliminate use of the term 'Judaism' altogether[140] and in those rare instances where *Ioudaismos* occurs in the original text let the translation be 'Judaean way of life'.

137. Esler, *Romans*, p. 252.

138. Esler, *Romans*, p. 12.

139. Concurring with, and following the lead of, Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, p. 70.

140. This proposal moves in an opposite direction from that of Marc Zvi Brettler ('Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism', *Catholic*

4. Let us avoid the terms 'Christian(s)' and 'Christianity' for identifying Jesus and his earliest followers. When referring to followers of Jesus in first and second centuries after the death of Jesus, let us use the name 'Christian' only in those instances when the primary sources do so (mostly on the lips of outsiders). Let us employ the various identifiers that Jesus' followers used for identifying themselves: 'Israelites', 'disciples', 'holy ones', 'children of God', 'brothers', 'sisters', 'household/family of God', 'brother[and sister]hood', 'Israel of God', 'the Way', 'the new creation', 'the body of Christ', and all the many more.

In all cases, let us restrict ourselves to the nomenclature employed in the particular texts under investigation. And let us forthrightly explain our reasons for employing this nomenclature where necessary. This procedure may appear cumbersome, but it will be faithful to the language of the texts and will help minimize historical and social distortion.

Lest the thrust of this study be misunderstood or misconstrued, let me be perfectly clear. My concern here is that we finally agree to employ terms of identification and self-identification today that reflect, and are consistent with, the historical, social and cultural situation and practice of Jesus and his early followers. I presume, along with the majority of exegetes, the rootedness of Jesus and the early Jesus movement in the Israel of their day. This study gives no support whatsoever to any who dispute this fact and isolate Jesus and his followers from their Israelite matrix. My point is that calling Jesus an Israelite rather than a Jew is consistent with Israelite usage in Jesus' time and more accurately indicates his identity and that of his earliest followers. I am urging that we hone our nomenclature to be as historically accurate and contextually appropriate as possible since so much is at stake.[141]

Biblical Quarterly 61.3 [1999], pp. 429-47). Brettler suggests that, rather than eliminating use of the term Judaism altogether, we 'expand the use of the term "Judaism(s)" into the pre-exilic period, thereby reflecting the continuity of tradition and practice' (p. 445). In my opinion this would be allowing a current ideological concern for communal continuity to trump an interest in historical, social and cultural accuracy.

141. I am grateful to colleagues Amy-Jill Levine and Caroline Johnson Hodge for their helpful comments (in private communications, 23 May 2005 and 4 May 2005, respectively) on the version of this paper presented in Nova Scotia in 2004. Their criticisms and questions have prompted me to revise and amend for the sake of greater clarity and, I hope, greater cogency.